पावका नः सरस्वती

वाङ्मयी

(लखनऊविश्वविद्यालयीयसंस्कृतप्राकृतभाषा–
विभागीयाऽनुसन्धानपत्रिका)

अङ्कौ १०–११ • अब्दौ २००२–२००३

संस्कृतप्राकृतभाषाविभागः
लखनऊविश्वविद्यालयः,
लखनऊ

पा॒व॒का न॒: सर॑स्वती

वाङ्मयी

(लखनऊविश्वविद्यालयीय-संस्कृतप्राकृतभाषा-
विभागीयाऽनुसन्धानपत्रिका)

अङ्कौ १०–११ अब्दौ २००२–२००३

'वेदव्याख्यान : महत्ता, परम्परा और सम्भावनाएँ'

राष्ट्रिय–परिचर्चोद्घाटनावसरे (२७.५.२००३)
उत्तरप्रदेशराज्यपाल-महामहिम-*आचार्य*
विष्णुकान्त-शास्त्रि-महोदयैर्लोकार्पिता

प्रधानसम्पादकः

प्रो. अशोककुमारकालिया

सम्पादकः

डॉ. बृजेशकुमारशुक्लः

सहसम्पादकः

डॉ. प्रयागनारायणमिश्रः

संस्कृतप्राकृतभाषाविभागः
लखनऊविश्वविद्यालयः, लखनऊ

परामर्शदातृसमितिः
प्रो. कृष्णकुमार–मिश्रः
प्रो. रमाशङ्कर–मिश्रः
डॉ. लामा एस्.–राल्डी
डॉ. प्रीति–सिनहा
डॉ. उमारानी–त्रिपाठी
डॉ. अरुणा–शुक्ला
डॉ. सुधा–वाजपेयी
डॉ. मीरा–रस्तोगी

प्रकाशिका
शोधविमर्शगोष्ठी
संस्कृतप्राकृतभाषाविभागः
लखनऊ-विश्वविद्यालयः, लखनऊ

मूल्यम्–१००.०० रूप्यकाणि

मुद्रकः
प्नारआफसेट
'इन्द्रा-अनुष्ठानम्' गुईनरोड, अमीनाबाद, लखनऊ
फोन : २२१३५६५, २२२३७५७

विषयाऽनुक्रमणी

• सम्पादकीयम्		
• Studies in the Imagery of the Rāmāyaṇa	Prof. K.A. Subrahmanya Iyer	३
• Fundamentals of the Vedic Epistemology	Prof. S. P. Singh	६७
• भारविकाव्य-वैभवम्	डॉ. रामसेवक दुबे	६१
• संस्कृत वाङ्मय में वृत्ति-विमर्श	डॉ. अनिल कुमार सिन्हा	१०५
• मुद्राराक्षस की टीका-परम्परा	शुचि	१२१
• संस्कृत एवं कम्प्यूटर की पारस्परिक उपकार्योपकारकता	पत्रिका जैन	१२७

सम्पादकीयम्

गीर्वाणवाङ्मयस्यानुसन्धानपरम्पराया वर्त्म कीदृशं स्यादिति लक्ष्ये साफल्यमुपगतैषा *'वाङ्मयी'*-पत्रिका लक्ष्मणपुरविश्वविद्यालयस्थ-संस्कृतप्राकृतभाषाविभाग-साहाय्येन प्रकाश्यते। एतत्पूर्वमस्याः पत्रिकायाः कतिपयेऽङ्काः प्राकाश्यमुपगतास्ते सर्वे विद्वज्जनैरनुसन्धातृभिश्च नितरामादृता अभिनन्दनभाजनत्वं सम्प्राप्ताः। सम्प्रति संस्कृतप्राकृतभाषाविभागीयाया अस्या *वाङ्मयी*-पत्रिकायाः संयुक्ताङ्कोऽयं विशिष्टं किमपि महत्त्वं स्वात्मनि क्रोडी करोति, यतो हि येषां महापुरुषाणां सत्प्रयासैः संस्कृत-प्राकृतभाषा-विभागोऽयं विशिष्टं स्वरूपं किमप्यधिगतवान्, तेभ्यः कार्तज्ञयाऽन्वितश्रद्धा-कुसुमाञ्जलि-निवेदनं यथावसरमवश्यं करणीयमित्येतस्मिन् पावनकर्मण्यस्ति विभागस्याऽस्य सुदृढोऽभिनिदेशः। अत एवैतस्मिन्नङ्के देववाणीसमुपासकानां संस्कृतविभाग–संस्थापकानां भगवतां विद्वद्वरेण्यानां श्रीमदय्यरमहोदयानामेको विशिष्टो लेखः सम्पादकैः समपादि। एष शोधलेखस्तावद्–भण्डारकर-प्राच्य-शोधसंस्थानस्य 'जर्नल ऑफ ओरियण्टल रिसर्च' - वार्षिकशोधपत्रिकायां बहुकाले गते तया संस्थया प्राकाशि, किन्तु नाद्यतनकाले खल्वेष उपलभ्यते। एतत्सर्वमवलोक्य तत्रभवतामय्यर- महोदयानां सर्वाङ्गीणं शोधपत्रमेतद् विद्वज्जनप्रमोदाय प्रकाश्यतेऽत्र 'Studies in the Imagery of the Rāmāyaṇa' इति नामधेये शोधपत्र आचार्यवर्यैः रामायणस्य यानि तथ्यानि प्रत्यपादिषत तानि सर्वाणि निश्चप्रचमेवाऽदृष्ट- पूर्वाणि। मन्तुं शक्यते तावदेतस्मिन् विषये यत्किञ्चिदुक्तं तत्सर्वमेत- दुच्छिष्टमेव। एतत्सर्वमङ्गी-कृत्य पत्रिकायामेतस्यां यत्प्रकाशितं प्राकाशि न तदकारि पुनरुक्तता काचित्सम्पादकैरपितु पुनरुक्तवदाभासालङ्कारवत् सहृदय-सुधियां धियोऽलङ्काराय कल्पते। अपरो लेखः प्रो. सत्यप्रकाशसिंह- महोदयानां शेमुषीभिः पल्लवितश्च कश्चित् Fundamentals of the Vedic Epistemology इति शीर्षकं लभते। एतस्मिल्लेखेऽपि वेदविषयिणी या सामग्री विनिहिताऽत्र सा वेदतत्त्वानुशीलनपराणां कृते नितरामुपादेयतां

भजते। 'भारविकाव्यवैभव'मितिशीर्षकान्वितं शोधपत्रं डॉ.रामसेवकदुबेमहोदयेनाऽलेखि, एतस्मिन्नपि नारिकेलफलसम्मितस्य भारविवचः स्फोटनं सुतरां सहजतया विहितम्। एतदतिरिक्तं डॉ. अनिलकुमारसिनहामहोदयस्य 'संस्कृत वाङ्मय में वृत्तिविमर्श' इति नामधेयो लेखोऽपि रमणीयः। विभागस्याऽस्य द्वाभ्यां शोधच्छात्रीभ्यां 'मुद्राराक्षस की टीकापरम्परा', 'संस्कृत एवं कम्प्यूटर की पारस्परिक उपकार्योपकारकता' इत्यभिधानयोर्लेखयोः शुचिपत्रिकाभ्यां स्वप्रतिभोन्मेषं विधाय शुचिपत्रिकैषाऽलमकारि।

इत्थं *वाङ्मयी*-पत्रिकैषा विषयवैविध्येन शोधपूर्णलेखैश्च परिपूर्णा सती विभागस्याऽस्य गौरवमुपनेष्यतीति दृढो विश्वासः। अयं खलु लब्धप्रसरोऽस्ति विभागो यद् वेदव्याख्यानसङ्गोष्ठीसमुद्घाटनस्य शुभायां वेलायामस्याः *वाङ्मयी*पत्रिकाया विमोचनं लखनऊ-विश्वविद्यालयस्य कुलाधिपतीनां उत्तरप्रदेशस्य राज्यपालमहोदयानां महामहिमशालिनामाचार्यवर्याणां प्रो. ***विष्णुकान्तशास्त्रि***- महोदयानां करकमलाभ्यां विधास्यते। एतत्खलु सौभाग्यं पत्रिकाया विभागस्य च।

अपि चाऽस्यां पत्रिकायां यैर्विद्वद्वरेण्यैरनुसन्धातृभिश्च स्वकीयानि शोधपत्राणि दत्तानि ते सर्वेऽपि धन्यवादपदवीमवतरन्ति, तेभ्यः कृतज्ञत्वं वहति विभागोऽयम्। प्रकाशनकर्मणि यैरपि महानुभावैः स्वसाहाय्यं प्रत्तं तेषां समेषां कार्तज्ञ्यं विभागोऽयं भूम्नाऽऽवहति।

आशास्यते यदेषा प्रकाशिता पत्रिका विदुषां शोधकर्तॄणां च मनसि मुदितां जनयिष्यति। अनया पत्रिकयाऽवश्यमेवाऽनुसन्धित्सूनामुत्साहवर्धनं बोभूयिष्यत इति विभागस्याऽस्य सत्कल्पना। शीघ्रतया प्रकाशने मुद्रणसम्बद्धा अशुद्धयोऽपराश्च त्रुटयो वा कुत्रचिच्चेद् दृष्टिपथमुपयान्ति तर्हि 'हसन्ति दुर्जनास्तत्र समादधति सज्जना' इति सूक्तिमवलम्ब्य विद्वद्भिस्तास्त्रुटयः सुष्ठु परिमार्जनीयाऽथवा सूचना दातव्या, येन भावि परिमार्जनं भवेदिति पत्रिकां विपश्चितां करसरोरुहेभ्यः समर्प्य सम्पादकाः स्वात्मानं कृतकृत्यं मन्वाना नितरां प्रमोदमुपगच्छन्ति।

।। इति शम्।।

❑ ❑ ❑

Studies in the Imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*

Prof. K. A. Subrahmanya Iyer
Founder Head, Deptt. of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages, Lucknow University

I

Despite the Dhvanivāda, which assigns a subordinate place to *Alankāras* or figurative images, both poets and critics have always shown immense interest in them in India. Bharata, the earliest of the known writers who deal with the subject of Alankāras, recognises four of them in his *Nāṭyaśāstra*,[1] but their number went on increasing, until it reached the respectable number of 125 in the *Kuvalayānanda* of Appayya Dīkṣita, without, of course, counting the Sub-divisions. The last great work belonging to the *Alankāraśāstra*, the *Rasagangādhara* of Jagannāthapaṇḍita, written long after the *Dhvanivāda* had received almost universal recognition at the hands of poets and critics is primarily a detailed study of the *Alankāras*. It is not merely critics who take delight in defining and analysing these figures of speech, but poets also exhibit a weakness for them throughtout the whole period of Sanskrit literature. Nor is there anything surprising in this. Figurative imagery is bound to have its place in all good poetry. Even critics like the *Dhvanivādin-s*, who have declared that poetry has a higher function to perform than the mere presentation

1. Bharata-*Nāṭyaśāstra*, XVI. (Benares Edition).

S. K. De. *Sanskrit Poetics* II, p. 6.

of beautiful imagery, have admitted that imagery, if carefully used, can serve this very higher purpose.

The interest of our critics, from Bharata to Jagannātha-paṇdita, has, however, been in the form of the *Alankāra-s*. It must be admitted that our *Ālankārikas* have bequeathed to us a very deep, penetrating and detailed analysis of the *forms* that Sanskrit imagery can assume. Great efforts were made to distinguish one form from another. In later times, all the devices provided by the *Navīnanyāya* for reaching extreme accuracy in definitions were adopted for the purpose. The history of the *Alankāraśāstra* is, to a very great extent, the history of the discovery of newer and newer forms of images, of a more and more scientific basis for classifying them and of the formulation of more and more accurate definitions of them. Appayya Dikṣita's *"Citramīmāmsā"* and Jagannāthapaṇdita's *"Rasagangādhara"* are indications of the kind of controversies that must have been carried on in circles of critics in ancient India.

There is, however, something more than form in any given image. An image usually involves a comparison and a comparison presupposes three things :- the object of comparison (the *upameya*) the standard of comparison, (the *upamāna*) and the point of similarity (the *samānadharma*). These might be called the contents of an image. The contents might remain the same while the form varies and the form might remain the same, while the contents vary. The following passage from the *"Citramīmāmsā"* would make this quite clear :-

चन्द्र इव मुखमिति सादृश्यवर्णनं तावदुपमा। सैवोक्तिभङ्गीभेदेनाने-कालंकारभावं भजते। तथा हि– "चन्द्र इव मुखं मुखमिव चन्द्रः" इत्युपमेयोपमा। "मुखं मुखमिव" इत्यनन्वयः। "मुखमिव चन्द्रः" इति प्रतीपम्। "चन्द्रं दृष्टवा मुखं स्मरामि" इति स्मरणम्। "मुखमेव चन्द्रः" इति रूपकम्। "मुखचन्द्रेण तापः शाम्यति" इति परिणामः। "किमिदं

मुखमुताहो चन्द्रः" इति सन्देहः ।[1]

In the above passage, the contents of all the figures of speech are the same, namely, the face and the moon; but the form varies according as it is *upamā*, or *rūpaka* or something else.

The *Alaṅkāraśāstra* is essentially an analysis of the form of the images. This analysis was undertaken partly to satisfy a natural intellectual curiosity and partly, because, it was felt that it had something to do with the aesthetic pleasure we feel when we come across a beautiful image. It may be admitted that it has something to do with it. How else can we explain the different effect on us of the different figures of speech even when the contents remain the same ? But one may also ask the question : have not the contents also something to do with it? When Kālidāsa writes :-

अथ वा कृतवाग्द्वारे वंशेऽस्मिन् पूर्वसूरिभिः ।
मणौ वज्रसमुत्कीर्णे सूत्रस्येवास्ति मे गतिः ।।[2]

Do we like the comparison-only because it has taken the form of *upamā*, or also, because, of its appropriateness i.e., for its contents ?

We cannot doubt that our *Ālaṅkārika-s* had recognised the share of the contents in making an image beautiful. According to Bhāmaha, the defects of an *upamā*, as mentioned by Medhāvin, are as follows :-

हीनतासंभवो लिङ्गवचोभेदो विपर्ययः ।
उपमानाधिकत्वं च तेनासदृशतापि च ।।[3]

Vamāna's list is almost identical :-

1. *Citramimāmsā*, p. 6, (Nirnaya Sāgara Press Edition).
2. *Raghu.* I, 4.
3. *Bhāmahalankāra,* II. 39.

हीनत्वाधिकत्वलिङ्गवचनभेदासादृश्यासम्भवास्तद्दोषाः[1] ।

It will be observed that these are defects in the contents of the *upamā* and not in the *form*. Appayya Dikṣita puts the whole thing in a more positive form when he says :-

उपमानोपमेयत्वयोग्ययोरर्थयोर्द्वयोः ।
हृद्यं साधर्म्यमुपमेत्युच्यते काव्यवेदिभिः ।।

कविसमयप्रसिद्ध्यनुरोधेनोपमानोपमेयत्वयोग्ययोरेव साधर्म्यमुपमा। न त्वतथाभूतयोः। अत एव "कुमुदमिव मुखं प्रसन्नम्" इत्यादि नोपमा। तथाभूतयोरपि वस्तुत्वंद्रव्यत्वादिकृतमहृद्यं साधर्म्यं न तथा। किं तु हृद्यमेव कान्तिमत्त्वादिकम्। सर्वोऽपि ह्यलंकारः कविसमयप्रसिद्ध्यनुरोधेन हृद्यतया काव्यशोभाकर एवालंकारतां भजते। अतः "गोसदृशो गवयः" इति नोपमा। "गौर्वाहीकः" इति न रूपकम्। "स्थाणुर्वा पुरुषो वा" इति न सन्देहः। "इदं रजतं" इति न भ्रान्तिमान्। "नायं सर्पः" इति नापह्नुतिः। "पीनो देवदत्तो दिवा न भुङ्क्ते" इति न पर्यायोक्तम्। "पर्वतो वह्निमान्" इति नानुमानम्। "स देवदत्तः" इति न स्मरणम्। "तस्य स्थमिपां तांतंतामः" इति न यथासंख्यम्। "पुत्रेण सहागतः पिता" इति न सहोक्तिः। "तेन विना गतः" इति न विनोक्तिः। "श्वेतां धावति" इति न श्लेषः[2] ।

The meaning of this passage cannot be mistaken. There is here recognition, in theory at least, of the importance of the pleasure we feel when we come across a good image. A recent English writer says :- "What precisely is the origin of the pleasure we take in the pictures of metaphor and simile, as distinct from unfigurative word-picture ? I think that, over and above the delight in a picture, there is a little shock or surprise caused by the unexpected rapprochement of two notions that seemed, a moment before, unconnected and remote from one another. The noticing of likenesses (need 1 refer to babies ?) would seem an ever-fresh source of pleasure - we call comprisons odious, but love

1. Vamana's *Kāvyālankārasūtra Vṛtti*, IV, ii, 8.
2. *Citramīmāmsā*, p. 6.

them none the less. And when the likeness in perceived in the midst of unlikeness, perhaps even despite obvious and preponderating unlikeness, perhaps even despite obvious and preponderating unlikeness, the pleasure is proportionately greater."[1]

In spite of this theoretical recognition of the importance of the *contents* for the beauty of an image, we find in our *Alaṅkāraśāstra* no study, no analysis of them. But if it is true that the contents have something to do with the pleasure we derive from beautiful images and if it is true that imagery has played a conspicuous part in all periods of Sanskrit literature, then such an analysis of the contents of the images might yield interesting results. It should, it seems to me, throw some light on the history of Sanskrit literature. It would show to what extent the contents vary or remain the same in the different authors and periods of Sanskrit literature. Explanation would have to be sought for the variation or the repetition, as the case may be. It would show the range of the poetic power of the different writers and their relation to one another. It might throw some light on the relation between *form* and *content* in the evolution of the images. In short, no history of Sanskrit literature could be considered complete which did not include a historical treatment of Sanskrit imagery, from the point of view of form as well as of content. In the existing works on the History of Sanskrit literature, such as those of Professors Keith and Winternitz, there are, no doubt, many interesting remarks on the imagery of Sanskrit poets, but no systematic treatment. The task is a big one, but a beginning has to be made. The following pages are no more than an humble attempt at such a beginning. I have thought it best to begin with the Vālmīki-*Rāmāyaṇa*[2], because it is there that we find

1. Stephen. J. Brown. *"The World or Imagery."* London 1927.
2. The Bombay Recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa* has been used for this study.

the beginnings of *Kāvya*.

The first step in the study of the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is to determine the occasions on which the images appear in the work. As every one knows, the work is an immense one. As one reads it, all sorts of scenes pass before one's eyes. There are descriptions of cities and landscapes, fierce *rākṣasas* and mighty monkeys. There are moving scenes in which husband and wife, father and son, master and servant, king and subject, prince and priest take part and give expression to their innermost feelings. There are moving scenes in which husband and wife, father and son, master and servant, king and subject, prince and priest take part and give expression to their innermost feelings. There are accounts of duels and battles, devastation of countries, burning of cities and ruthless destruction of armies by weapons, human and divine. There are speeches born of indignation and anger, lamentations expressive of profound sorrow, and exhortations of wisdom. With all this, the work is mainly a continuous narrative of events, big and small. Into the main story of Rāma and his exploits are woven countless episodes centering round the minor characters of the work. The question before us, however, is : In all this variety and richness of subject-matter, what are the occasions which particularly call forth imagery from the poet? In answer to this, it may be stated, in a general manner, that images are found throughout the work. There is hardly a *sarga* in which at least a few comparisons do not occur. They may not always be very striking, they are often mere repetitions of quite commonplace images like कमलपत्राक्ष, इन्दीवरश्याम, राजीवलोचन, नरशार्दूल, मुनिपुंगव, देवसंकाश etc. Our interest lies not in these, but in those which occur on special occasions. For, there are some occasions on which these images seem to come in quick succession and in greater abundance. It is these which are striking

and arrest our attention. It is these which seem to have been introduced by the poet deliberately, with a full knowledge of the effect they will have on the hearer or the reader. I give below a list of passages in which the images are thus more striking. It is by no means an exhaustive list, but, I hope, sufficiently complete, not to invalidate any conclusion that may be drawn from it.

I. 18, 50-52	...	Daśaratha describes his joy on the arrival of Viśvāmitra and compares the occasion to others.
I. 48, 2-5	...	Sumati asks Viśvāmitra who Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa are, while describing them.
I. 49, 14-15	...	Description of Ahalyā as Rāma sees her.
I. 55, 9-10	...	Description of Viśvāmitra, defeated and humiliated by Vasiṣṭha.
II. 1.	...	Description of Rāma by Daśaratha.
II. 2.	...	Description of Rāma by the people.
II. 3, 27-29.	...	Description of Rāma as Daśaratha sees him coming.
II. 4, 5, 6.	...	Description of the preparations for the *abhiṣeka* of Rāma as *Yuvarāja*.
II. 7, 1-30	...	Mantharā's speech to Kaikeyi on hearing of Rāma's coronation.
II. 8.	...	Mantharā's speech.
II. 9, 41-46.	...	Kaikeyī's description of Mantharā.
II. 10, 23-26.	...	Description of Kaikeyī in distress.
II. 12.		Speech of Daśaratha on hearing of Kaikeyī's two boons.
II. 15.		Sumantra's description of Rāma's palace.

II. 16, 9 f.f.		Sumantra's description of Rāma.
II. 16.		Poet's description of Rāma as he goes out to meet Daśaratha.
II. 18, 4-7.		Description of Daśaratha in distress.
II. 20, 32-34	...	Description of Kausalyā in distress.
II. 20, 9-55	...	Kausalyā's lamentation on hearing of Rāma's exile.
II. 34, 2-3.	...	Description of Daśaratha in distress.
II. 40.	...	Departure of Rāma.
II. 43.	...	Lamentation of Kausalyā.
II. 59, 28-30	...	Lamentation of Daśaratha.
II. 65, 66.	...	Lamentation of Daśaratha's wives after his death.
II. 73, 1-5.	...	Bharata's indignation on hearing Rāma's exile.
II. 93, 8-15.	...	Description of Citrakūṭa by Bharata.
II. 94.	...	Description of Citrakūṭa by Rāma.
III. 16.	...	Description of winter in Pañcavaṭī.
III. 19, 3-4.	...	Khara's speech on seeing Sūrpaṇakhā mutilated.
III. 26,27,28,29,30	...	Description of battle between Rāma and the Rākṣasas.
III. 31, 41-44.	...	Mārīca's advice to Rāvaṇa not to take Sītā away.
III. 38		
III. 37, 12-20	...	Mārīca's second speech to the same effect.
III. 47, 32 f.f.	...	Sītā's reply when Rāvaṇa proposes

		marriage.
III. 51.	...	Battle between Jaṭāyus and Rāvaṇa.
III. 52.	...	Description of the ravishment of Sītā.
III. 52.	...	Sītā's reply to Rāvaṇa's proposal of marriage.
IV. 14, 19-23.	...	Sugrīva going out for battle.
IV. 15, 19-21.	...	Description of Rāma by Tārā.
IV. 17, 1 f.f.	...	Description of fallen Vālin.
IV. 19, 21-26.	...	" " " by Tārā.
IV. 23, 22-28.	...	Lamentation of Tārā.
IV. 28.	...	Description of the rainy season.
IV. 29.	...	" " " autumn.
V. 1.	...	" Hanumān's leap across the ocean.
V. 2.	...	" Laṅkā by Hanumān.
V. 4.	...	" Laṅkā.
V. 5.	...	" A moonlit night.
V. 6.	...	" Rāvaṇa's palace.
V. 7.	...	" " "
V. 9.	...	" " harem.
V. 10.	...	" " "
V. 14.	...	" Aśokavana.
V. 15.	...	" Sītā in distress.
V. 18.	...	" Rāvaṇa's visit to Sītā.
V. 19.	...	" Sītā in distress.
V. 21.	...	Sītā's reply to Rāvaṇa's proposal.
V. 22.	...	Speeches of Rāvaṇa and Sītā.
V. 28.	...	Sītā's lamentation.

V. 56.	...	Description of mountain.
V. 57.	...	" Hanumān's return leap.
VI. 5.	...	Rāma's lamentation.
VI. 16.	...	Rāvaṇa's indignant speech to Vibhīṣaṇa.
VI. 24.	...	Rāvaṇa's angry speech to Śuka.
VI. 53.	...	Battle between Vajradamṣṭra and Śuka.
VI. 58.	...	" Prahasta and Nīla.
VI. 59.	...	Description of Rākṣasas.
VI. 61.	...	Description of Kumbhakarṇa.
VI. 71.	...	" Atikāya.
VI. 102.	...	Fight between Rāma and Rāvaṇa.
VI. 103.	...	" " "
VI. 111.	...	Vibhīṣaṇa's lamentation on the death of Rāvaṇa.

Before explaining the above list, it must be stated that the bulk of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is made up of narratives, written in a simple style, in which the story progresses from incident to incident and episode to episode. Interspersed among these narratives and forming, on the whole, *only a minor portion of the work* are some speeches and descriptions. It is quite clear from the above list that the images, when they do occur in greater abundance and in a striking manner, occur in these speeches and descriptions and not in the narrative portion of the work, which is devoted to the telling of the story. It is in these speeches and descriptions that we have to see the beginnings of the later-*Kāvyas*, in very many of which the narrative portion is reduced to the absolute minimum and the speeches and descriptions occupy the whole work.

Taking the speeches first, it will be found that they are generally uttered by the characters under the stress of some *emotion*. Somtimes it is *jealousy*, as in the case of Mantharā who addresses Kaikeyī when she hears of Rāma's impending coronation as Yuvarāja. Sometimes it is *sorrow*, as when Daśaratha and Kausalyā lament about Rāma's exile or when Tārā laments on the death of Vālin. Sometimes it is *righteous indignation*, as when Bharata hears of Rāma's exile or when Sītā rejects Rāvaṇa's proposal of marriage. Sometimes it is *pity*, as when Mārīca tries to dissuade Rāvaṇa from his scheme of taking Sītā away. These emotions spontaneously call forth imagery from the poet. The images are generally of a homely nature and therefore, very effective in expressing the emotion in question. Sītā's speech in III, 47 – when Rāvaṇa proposes marriage is a very good example.

This connection between image and emotion is, by the way, quite interesting, because it is one of the topics dealth with in the *Dhvanyāloka*.[1] Ānandavardhana is, on the whole, rather suspicious. He is afraid that too many images in a passage meant to evoke sentiment might distract the attention of the reader away from the latter. He advises caution, without barring images altogether. He sums up his views as follows :–

ध्वन्यात्मभूते शृङ्गारे समीक्ष्य विनिवेशितः ।
रूपकादिरलंकारवर्ग एति यथार्थताम् ।।
विवक्षा तत्परत्वेन नाङ्गित्वेन कथंचन ।
काले च ग्रहणत्यागौ नातिनिर्वहणैषिता ।।
निर्व्यूढावपि चाङ्गत्वे यत्नेन प्रत्यवेक्षणम् ।
रूपकादेरलंकारवर्गस्याङ्गत्वसाधनम् ।।[2]

This errs perhaps on the side of caution. The English

1. *Dhvanyāloka*, p. 85 f.f.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 88

writer quoted above goes much farther when he writes :- "The more emotion grows upon a man, the more his speech, if he makes any effort to express his emotion, abounds in figures– exclamation, interrogation, anacoluthon, apostrophe, hyperbole (yes certainly, hyperbole 1) simile, metaphor. His language is what we sometimes euphemestically describe as 'picturesque'. Feelings swamp ideas and language is used to express, not the reality of things, but the state of one's emotions."[1]

I must not be understood to say that *all* emotional speeches in the *Rāmāyaṇa* abound in figurative images. I only mean that they have a *strong tendency to do so*. There are some expections. For example, there is the first reply of Daśaratha to Viśvāmitra when the latter asks for Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to be sent with him for the protection of his sacrifice. The request must have given a shock to Daśaratha and his reply is, no doubt, full of emotions, but there is hardly any image in it.

The description in the *Rāmāyaṇa* are of a most straight-forward nature, much as we would expect them to be when art is in the first stage. All the things contained in the thing to be described are enumerated in detail. No attempt seems to have been made to pick and choose. One could say they are almost like cataogues, if the word did not connote absolute absence of poetic merit. The following description of *Citrakūṭa* by Rāma might be considered a typical one :-

पश्येममचलं भद्रे ! नानाद्विजगणायुतम् ।
शिखरैः खमिवोद्विद्धेर्धातुमद्भिर्विभूषितम् ।।
केचिद्रजतसंकाशाः केचित् क्षतजसन्निभाः ।
पीतमाञ्जिष्ठवर्णाश्च केचिन्मणिवरप्रभाः ।।
पुष्पार्ककेतकाभाश्च केचिज्ज्योतीरसप्रभाः ।

1. *The world of Imagery*, p. 90.

विराजतेऽचलेन्द्रस्य देशा धातुविभूषिताः ।
नानामृगगणैर्द्वीपितरक्ष्वृक्षगणैर्वृताः ।
अदुष्टैर्भात्ययं शैलो बहुपक्षिसमाकुलः ।।
आम्रजम्ब्वसनैर्लोध्रैः प्रियालैः पनसैर्धवैः ।
अङ्कोलैर्भात्यतिनिशैर्बिल्वतिन्दुकवेणुभिः ।।
काश्मर्यारिष्टवरणैर्मधूकैस्तिलकैरपि ।
बदर्यामलकैर्नीपैर्वेत्रधन्वनबीजकैः ।।
पुष्पवद्भिः फलोपेतैः छायावद्भिर्मनोरमैः ।
एवमादिभिराकीर्णः श्रियं पुष्यत्ययं गिरिः ।।[1]

This passage illustrates not only the detailed, catalogue-like nature of the description, but also their *directness*. When the poet wants to say that there are wild animals on the mountain, he says, quite directly : "नानामृगगणैर्द्वीपितरक्ष्वृक्षगणैर्वृतः". This point will become still clearer when we compare this with what Kālidāsa does in similar circumstances. When he wants to say that there are lions and elephants on the Himalaya, he does not say so directly, but says :-

पदं तुषारस्रुतिधौतरक्तं यस्मिन्नदृष्ट्वापि हतद्विपानाम् ।
विन्दन्ति मार्गं नखरन्ध्रमुक्तैर्मुक्ताफलैः केसरिणः किराताः ।।[2]

It is into such direct and detailed descriptions that the poet, introduces his imagery, which therefore, serves, chiefly, to add vividness to the details and lend a certain picturesquences to the whole description. How this is done can be best understood if we now study the contents of the images.

II

It was shown in the preceeding article that our Ālankārikas, as well as modern critics, recognize that the

1. *Rāmā*, II. 9, 4-10.
2. *Kumārasambhava*, I, 6.

contents of a poet's imagery have as much to do with the pleasure we derive from it as its form. The study of these contents is, however, beset with many difficulties. The most important of them all is their extra-ordinary richness and variety. The sources of poetic imagery are virtually inexhaustible. They are co-extensive with the universe. The only possible limitation is the limitation of the poet's genius and experience. A gifted poet can compare any two things in the world. He can see resemblance where our eyes fail to detect any. Nor does he follow any fixed rules in the choice of the contents of his images. The thing compared, the object to which it is compared and the point of comparison-all follow the needs of the occasion and nothing more. To analyse and classify the sources of a poet's imagery is, to say the least, a laborious task.

As in the case of the other poets of India or for the matter of that, of the world, external nature forms the chief source of the imagery of Vālmīki. Mountains and rivers, birds and animals, trees and forests, all the infinite variety of creation provides innumerable points of comparison to our author. So do the celestial bodies like the sun and the moon, the stars and the planets figure constantly in the descriptions and speeches of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Equally prominent in the imagery of the poet are the natural phenomena of the sky, thunder and lightning, clouds and rain, rainbows and comets. Closely connected with nature is religion as a source of imagery. This is natural as epic religion is only a development of Vedic religion, which, as every one knows, is essentially a worship of the powers of nature personified. Not only do the higher gods like Indra, Viṣṇu and Varuṇa, but a host of minor gods and semi-divine beings, Yakṣa-s, Kinnara-s, Gandharva-s and similar beings play an important part in the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. They form a world of their own,

a world not absolutely inacessible to man, but inhabited by beings who communicate often with men and interfere in their lives and *vice-versa*. If Indra, the god, helps human beings to win battles against their enemies, Daśaratha, the human King, also goes to help Indra in his fight against the Asura-s. There is no very clear line of demarcation between our world and the world of gods and demi-gods. A god can become a man and a man can turn into a god according to his deeds and even without any such transformation, there is constant communication between the two worlds.

It is not merely religion considered as a body of conceptions which is a rich source of imagery to the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, but its ritualistic side also occasionally furnishes a comparison or two. Thus, when Bharata returns to Ayodhyā, the city is all silent like an altar after the scarifice is over, empty of all sacrificial utensils and abandoned by the priests[1]. Sometimes, though very rarely, the poet turns to scholarly traditions for his comparisons. When Hanumān sees Sītā in the Aśokavana, in a state of extreme distress, devoid of all ornaments, looking very different from what she should, she is compared to a word which expresses a meaning different from its real one, when it is deprived of its correct grammatical form.[2] Equally rare are images of an abstract nature, drawn from the subjective experience of man. The quote an example or two, Sītā in distress is compared to Hope baffled[3], to Faith destroyed[4],

---

1. त्यक्तां यज्ञायुधैः सर्वैरभिरूपैश्च याजकैः ।
   सुत्याकाले सुनिर्वृत्ते वेदिं गतरवामिव ।। *Rāmā* II - 114-8.

2. दुःखेन बुबुधे सीतां हनूमाननलंकृताम् ।
   संस्कारेण यथा हीनां वाचमर्थान्तरं गताम् ।। *Ibid.*, V - 15-39.

3. आशां प्रतिहतामिव । *Ibid.*, V - 19-11.

4. विहतामिव च श्रद्धाम् । *Ibid.*, V - 15-33.

to Wisdom in decay[5], and to an Order disobeyed[6]. In this connection, one might also mention a few figures drawn from sea-life, though they are also quite rare. Thus Sita in distress is like a boat in the middle of the ocean, buffeted by the winds[7].

The rarity of the images drawn from these latter sources does not cause any particular surprise. What strikes one, however, is the extraordinary scarcity, amounting almost to complete absence, of comparisons drawn from ancient legends and heroic tales. While works like the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* have been a prolific source of imagery to later writers, one would think, while reading the *Rāmāyaṇ*a, that no heroic literature existed at all before it. Countless, indeed, are the occasions when the characters of the *Rāmāyaṇa* could have been compared to heroes of old, but instead, they are likened to gods and demi-gods, rivers and mountains, birds and beasts. The difference in this respect, between the the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the later works may be illustrated by the following passage from the *Buddacarita* of *Aśvaghoṣa.* The occasion is the advice of Udāyī to Gotama who shows indifference to the pleasures of love. Udāyī mentions the names of great people who set much value by such pleasures. He says :–

कामं परमिति ज्ञात्वा देवोऽपि हि पुरंदरः।
गौतमस्य मुनेः पत्नीमहल्यां चकमे पुरा।।
अगस्त्यः प्रार्थयामास सोमभार्यां च रोहिणीम्।
तस्मात्तत्सदृशं लेभे लोपामुद्रामिति श्रुतिः।।
औतथ्यस्य च भार्यायां ममतायां महातपाः।
मारुत्यां जनयामास भरद्वाजं बृहस्पतिः।।
बृहस्पतेर्महिष्यां च जुह्वत्यां जुह्वतां वरः।

5. प्रज्ञामिव परिक्षीणाम्। *Ibid.*, V - 19-11.

6. आशां प्रतिहतामिव। *Ibid.*, V - 19-12.

7. वायुवेगैरिवाक्रान्तां मज्जन्तीं नावमर्णवे। *Ibid.*, III - 55.4, IV - 5.

बुधं विबुधधर्माणं जनयामास चन्द्रमाः।।
कालीं चैव पुरा कन्यां जलप्रभवसंभवाम्।
जगाम यमुनातीरे जातरागः पराशरः।।
मातङ्गयामक्षमालायां गर्हितायां रिरंसया।
कपिञ्जलादं तनयं वसिष्ठोऽजनयन्मुनिः।।
ययातिश्चैव राजर्षिर्वयस्यपि विनिर्गते।
विश्वाच्याप्सरसा सार्धं रेमे चैत्ररथे वने।।
स्त्रीसंसर्गं विना शान्तं पाण्डुर्ज्ञात्वापि कौरवः।
माद्रीरूपगुणाक्षिप्तः सिषेवे कामजं सुखम्।।
करालजनकश्चैव हृत्वा ब्राह्मणकन्यकाम्।
अवाप भ्रंशमप्येव न तु त्यजेच्च मन्मथम्।।
एवमाद्या महात्मानो विषयान् गर्हितानपि।
रतिहेतोर्बुभुजिरे प्रागेव गुणसंहितान्।।[1]

Such passages, full of allusions to old heroes are hardly ever met with in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

So much for the sources of Vālmikī's imagery. Another question which constantly arises in our minds while reading the *Rāmāyaṇa* is : how far is the imagery found in the work, the product of Vālmikī's own imagination and how far is it just his literary inheritance ? A very large number of images found in the *Rāmāyaṇa* are found in the *Mahābhārata* also and one feels they would be found in other works of a similar nature and of the same period, if we could but see them. With regard to these, one feels that they are not anybody's property in particular, but belong to the people as a whole. They must have occurred frequently in the ordinary speech of the people and probably do so even now. They can all be explained by reference to human nature and the character of the country in which Vālmikī and other poets lived. They are of a very simple nature and involve only the most obvious and conspicuous attributes of things visible

1. *B.C.* IV - 72-81.

to anybody and not only to the poet of gesniur. The fact that they are found in other works than the *Rāmāyaṇa* has to be explained and it seems to me that rather than assuming borrowal on the one side or the other, it would be safer to refer them all to a common source, namely, popular imagination and tradition. It would be a very long task to make a complete list of such images but, for the purposes of illustration, I am giving a few of them, taken from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārta*, in which there are similar situations, giving rise to similar images. Thus, in both, a man's voice is compared to the roaring of clouds[1]; in both, one trembles like a *kadalī* shaken in the wind[2], *Damayantī* separated from Nala and Sītā separated from Rāma are both very distressd and in their distress, they are likened to a lotus-bed spoiled by an elephant with all its leaves and lotuses pulled out, and its birds frightened away[3], or they are compared to a dried-up river[4], or to the moon hidden by black clouds. In both, a place that has lost its original beauty or greatness is compared to a lake devoid of its snakes[5], or an empty wine jar!

---

1. दुन्दुभिस्वरकल्पेन गम्भीरेणानुनादिना।
   स्वरेण महता राजा जीमूत इव नादयन्। *Rāma*. II - 2-20.
   यदि मां मेघनिर्घोषो नोपगच्छति नैषधः।
   अद्य चामीकरप्रख्यं प्रवेक्ष्यामि हुताशनम्।। *M. Bhā*. III - 7-11.
2. कम्पमानेव कदली वातेनाभिसमीरिता।
   कृष्णा राजानमासाद्य शोकार्ता न्यपतद्भुवि। *Ibid*., X - 11-7.
   सीता प्रवेपितोद्वेगात् प्रवाते कदली यथा।। *Rāma*. III - 2-15.
3. विध्वस्तपर्णकमलां वित्रासितविहङ्गमाम्।
   हस्तिहस्तपरिक्लिष्टां व्याकुलामिव पद्मिनीम्।। *M. Bhā*. III - 65-20.
   उत्कृष्टपर्णकमलां वित्रासिताविहङ्गमाम्।
   हस्तिहस्तपरामृष्टामाकुलामिव पद्मिनीम्।। *Rāma*. V - 19-15.
4. पतिशोकाकुलां दीनां कृशस्रोतां नदीमिव। *M. Bhā*. III - 65-19.
   उपक्षीणामिवापगाम्। *Rāma*. V - 19-14.
5. गतोत्सवं पुरमिव हृतनागमिव ह्रदम्। *Ibid*., IX - 63-5.
   महाह्रदमिवाक्षोभ्यं सुपर्णेन हृतोरगम्। *Rāma*.,

The list can be indefinitely lengthened. As to the other question, namely, when are we to know that an image is the product of Vālmikī's own imagination, the answer is not easy to give. To say positively that it occurs nowhere else than in the *Rāmāyaṇa* would necessitate a very laborious research and one is not quite certain that the result would be quite decisive. Mere presence or absence of an image in other works than the *Rāmāyaṇa* would be no proof of its popular origin or otherwise. Here we shall have to rely more on the nature of the image itself. Popular images are likely to be of a simple nature. Complex images are likely to be the products of particular minds. There are also some images which are not exactly complex, but so stricking, so beautiful, so peculiar that one feels they cannot have mere popular origin. One feels that not everybody can think of them. I realise that the test is rather subjective, but I also feel that in some cases at least, it is an unfailing test. When we are told that some one is as tall as a tree, or as huge as a mountain, or as lustrous as the sun, or as swift as the wind, or as deep as the ocean, we are not taking any undue risk in declaring that these are popular images, that we cannot say who thought of them first, that they are part of the literary heritage of all writers. But when we read in the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa*, in the course of a description of the rainy season, that the sky appears love-sick, with gentle breeze for its sighs, the red lustre of sun-set for its sandal paste and with its pale clouds[1], or that the mountains are like *Brahmacārin-s*, for they have dark clouds for *kṛṣṇājina*, streams of water for sacred thread and their caves are filled with wind, which is their *praṇāyāma*[2], or that the sky seems to be in agony, for it groans in the form of thunder when it is lashed with golden whips in

---

1. मन्दमारुतनिश्वासं सन्ध्याचन्दनरञ्जितम्।
आपाण्डुजलदं भाति कामातुरमिवाम्बरम्।। *Rāmā*., IV - 28-6.

2. मेघकृष्णाजिनधरा धारायज्ञोपवीतिनः।
मारुतापूरितगुहाः प्राधीता इव पर्वताः।। *Ibid*., IV - 28-10.

the form of flashes of lightning[1], we may be certain we are dealing with the products of Vālmīki's own imagination. These are instances of continues of continued metaphors, or metaphors worked out in detail and though an element or two in each metaphor may be of a popular nature, the combination of the different elements into a whole is the work of the poet. Thus, when we read that the night looks like a woman dressed in white silk, with the moon for face, stars for eyes, and moonlight for white silk[2], the indentification of the moon with the face is only the reversal of the well-known identification of the face with the moon. These complex metaphors are not always so pretty as those given above. Sometimes one feels that identifications are made merely for the sake of symmetry and therefore lose their charm. Thus there is a laborious and rather ingenious identification of a battle-ground with a river, in which the dead heroes are identified with banks, broken arms with great trees stream of flood with water, Death with the ocean into which it falls, liver and spleen with and mud, scattered entrails with weeds, broken limbs and heads with fish, vultures with swans, herons with *sārasa* birds, human fat with foam etc. etc[3]. This detailed metaphor may not

---

1. कशाभिरिव हैमीभिर्विद्युद्भिरभिताडितम्।
अन्तस्तनितनिर्घोषं सवेदनमिवाम्बरम्।। *Ibid.*, IV - 28-11.

2. रात्रिः शशाङ्कोदितसौम्यवक्त्रा तारागणोन्मीलितचारुनेत्रा।
ज्योत्स्नांशुकप्रावरणा विभाति नारीव शुक्लांशुकसंवृताङ्गी।। *Ibid.*,IV-30-46.

3. हतवीरौघवप्रां तु भग्नायुधमहाद्रुमाम्।
शोणितौघमहातोयां यमसागरगामिनीम्।
यकृत्प्लीहमहापङ्कां विनिकीर्णान्त्रशैवलाम्।
भिन्नकायशिरोमीनामङ्गावयवशाद्वलाम्।।
भिन्नकायशिरोमीनामङ्गावयवशाद्वलाम्।।
गृध्रहंसवराकीर्णां कङ्कसारससेविताम्।
मेदः फेनसमाकीर्णामावर्तस्वननिःस्वनाम्।।
तां कापुरुषदुस्तारां युद्धभूमिमयीं नदीम्।
नदीमिव घनापाये हंससारससेविताम्।।
राक्षसाः कपिमुख्यास्ते तेरुस्तां दुस्तरां नदीम्।। *Ibid.*, IV - 28-11.

rank high as poetry, but it can certainly not be of a popular origin. It is not merely such complex images which must be considered the poet's own creation. There are some others which are so striking that it is difficult to believe that they were just current coin among all poets. I cannot find better illustrations of this than some of the images descriptive of Hanumān's flight across the sea in the Sundarakāṇḍa. The arms of flying Hanumān, stretched out in the air with their five fingers, looked the five-headed snakes issuing out of mountains[1]. His copper-coloured face with its copper-coloured nose looked like the sun reddening at the time of its setting[2]. Flying Hanumān, with his white teeth and his tail encircling him looked like the sun with a halo round it[3]. The wind rushing past his armpits roars like a cloud[4]. Now diving into clouds and now coming out of them, he looked like the moon in its course across the Sky[5]. In his flight, he seemed up the sky, to scratch the moon, to carry the sky away with him with all its stars and the sun[6].

Thus the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is partly popular and partly Vālmīki's own creation. It would now be interesting to enquire what the objects of nature which play an important part in the comparisons of the *Rāmāyaṇa* are and for what reasons.

---

1. तस्याम्बरगतौ बाहू ददृशाते प्रसारितौ।
पर्वताग्राद्विनिष्क्रान्तौ पञ्चास्याविव पन्नगौ। *Rāma* V., 1-54.

2. मुखं नासिकया तस्य ताम्रया ताम्रमाबभौ।
संन्ध्या समभिस्पृष्टं यथा स्यात् सूर्यमण्डलम्।। *Ibid.*, - 1-58.

3. लाङ्गूलचक्रो हनुमाञ्छुक्लदंष्ट्रोऽनिलात्मजः।
व्यरोचत महाप्राज्ञः परिवेषीव भास्करः।। *Ibid.*, 1-60.

4. तस्य वानरसिंहस्य प्लवमानस्य सागरम्।
कक्षान्तरगतो वायुर्जीमूत इव गर्जति।। *Ibid.*, 1-62.

5. प्रविशन्नभ्रजालानि निपतंश्च पुनः पुनः।
प्रच्छन्नश्च प्रकाशश्च चन्द्रमा इव दृश्यते।। *Ibid.*, 1-80.

6. ग्रसमान इवाकाशं ताराधिपमिवोल्लिखन्।
हरन्निव सनक्षत्रं गगनं सार्कमण्डलम्।। *Ibid.*, 57-5.

As everybody knows, the work offers us a pageant of heroes and heroic deeds, in which the fortunes of men rise and fall alternately. It abounds in descriptions of men and women in all their physical and moral glory or degradation, when they are flushed with victory or crushed by defeat, when they are fired by courage or shrink in abject terror, when they are moved by love or burnt with hatred. What are the objects whose aid is invoked to describe these situations and what particular attributes in these objects attracted the attention of our author?

The *Rāmāyaṇa* is primarily a story of kings and princes, whether they belong to Ayodhyā or Mithilā or Kiṣkindhā or *Laṅkā*. Many, therefore, are the occasions when royal splendour and dignity have to be described. Kings and princes shine out from among other men by their royal lustre, power, wealth and heroism. The most natural comparison of a king in all his splendour, and a comparison which comes again and again, is the one with the gods, and particularly with Indra. Indra is the king, *par excellence* in the *Rāmāyaṇa*[1], and Amarāvatī is the *rājadhānī par excellence*. The king may be a man, or a monkey or a mere *Rākṣasa*, but still the comparison is admissible. Daśaratha shines in the midst of other kings as Indra among other gods. All kings, whether Hindu or barbarian, waited upon Daśaratha as the other gods upon Indra[2]. Rāvaṇa was seated

---

1. स लब्धमानैर्विनयान्वितैर्नृपैः
पुरालयैर्जानपदैश्च मानवैः।
उपोपविष्टैर्नृपतिर्वृतो बभौ
सहस्रचक्षुर्भगवानिवामरैः।। *Ibid.*, II - 1-51.
दिव्यैर्गुणैः शक्रसमो रामः सत्यपराक्रमः।। *Ibid.*, II - 2-28.
अभिभूतमिदं सर्वं विद्रुतं वानरं बलम्।
अस्मिन् प्लवगशार्दूले हते शक्रसमप्रभे।। *Ibid.*, IV - 19-13.
रथेन रामं महता खरस्ततः
समाससादेन्द्र इवोद्यताशनिः।। *Ibid.*, III - 26-38.

2. म्लेच्छाश्चार्याश्च ये चान्ये वनशैलान्तवासिनः।
उपासांचक्रिरे सर्वे तं देवा वासवं यथा।। *Ibid.*, II - 3-26.

amidst his ministers as Vāsava among Maruts[1]. He shines among *Rākṣasa-s* as Indra among Vasus[2]. Rāma takes the feet of Vasiṣṭha as Indra of Bṛhaspati[3]. The point of comparison is usually royal splendour, but sometimes '*vīrya*', heroism or wealth is mentioned. In regard to the latter, Vaiśravaṇa, or course, is the usual standard of comparison, while Viṣṇu also comes in occasionally for '*vīrya*'[4]. As for intelligence, the analogy is always with Bṛhaspati[5]. Some of the other gods are also occasionally mentioned for their different attributes; thus Rāma is dear of the world as Parjanya with his rain[6]; in battle, he is terrible, like the god of Death with his mouth open[7]; Rāvaṇa surrounded by *Rākṣasa-s* is like Rudra surrounded by *Bhūta-s*.

Equally prominent are the comparison of a king in his splendour with the phenomena of the sky, the sun, the moon and the stars. It is but natural that the most brilliant of all celestial bodies should figure in the description of the most brilliant among men and things. Rāma shines like the sun in autumn[8], with

---

1. उपोपविष्टं सचिवैर्मरुद्भिरिव वासवम्।। *Ibid.*, III. 31-4.
2. स रावणः शस्त्रभृतां मनस्विनां महाबलानां समितौ मनस्वी।
   तस्यां सभायां प्रभया चकाशे मध्ये वसूनामिव वज्रहस्तः।। *Ibid.*, VI. 1131.
3. पुरोहितस्याग्निसमस्य तस्य वै
   वृहस्पतेरिन्द्र इवामराधिपः।
   प्रगृह्य पादौ सुसमृद्धतेजसः
   सदैव तेनोपविवेश वासवः।। *Ibid.*, II. 104-28.
4. बुद्धया बृहस्पतेस्तुल्यो वीर्ये चापि शचीपतेः। *Ibid.*, II. 1-32.
   (दशरथः) धनैश्च संग्रहैश्चान्यैः शक्रवैश्रणोपमः। *Ibid.*, I. 1-6-3.
   विष्णुना सदृशो वीर्ये सोमवत् प्रियदर्शनः। *Ibid.*, I. 1-18.
5. बुद्धया बृहस्पतेस्तुल्यः। *Ibid.*, II. 2-30.
   उत्तरोत्तरयुक्तौ च वक्ता वाचस्पतिर्यथा। *Ibid.*, II. 2-43.
6. मतः प्रियतरो लोके पर्जन्य इव वृष्टिमान्। *Ibid.*, II. 1-38.
7. अजेयं समरे घोरं व्यात्ताननमिवाम्बरम्। *Ibid.*, III. 32-6.
8. विद्यासमुदितो रामः शुशुभे भीमविक्रमः। *Ibid.*, I. 22-22.
   सहस्ररश्मिर्भगवान् शरदीव दिवाकरः। *Ibid.*, I. 22-23.

Laksmaṇa, they look like the sun and the moon come to earth by chance[1]. Rāvaṇa in his splendour looks like the burning sun;[2] Sugrīva's lustre is like that of the sun[3] Laṅkā with Indrajit shines like the sky with the sun[4]. Some of the actions of kings are likened to those of the Sun. Thus Daśaratha enters his palace as the Sun enters the cloud[5]. Lakṣmaṇa enters Sugrīva's palace unobstructed as the Sun enters the cloud[6]. Mahodara, the Rākṣasa, mounts an elephant as the Sun mounts Mandara[7]. The Sun dissipates darkness, clears the fog, dries up water and scorches the earth and so will Rāma dissipate everybody's grief as soon as he is seen[8], so would Daśaratha remove Kaikeyi's fear[9], so does grief arising from not seeing Rā ma dry up Daśaratha's life[10], and so does grief due to Rāma's departure burn Kausalyā[11]. It is not merely kings and other outstanding

---

1. यदृच्छयेव संप्राप्तौ चन्द्रसूर्यो वसुंधराम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 3-13.
2. तेजोबलसमायुक्तं तपन्तमिव भास्करम्। *Ibid.*, 48-59.
3. ततस्त्विन्द्रजिता लङ्का सूर्यप्रतिमतेजसा।
   रराजाप्रतिवीर्येण द्यौरिवार्केण भास्वता।। *Ibid.*, VI. 73-16.
4. तानुवाच ततः प्राप्तान् राजार्कसदृशप्रभः। *Ibid.*, IV. 38-8.
5. विलपन् प्राविशद्राजा गृहं सूर्य इवाम्बुदम्। *Ibid.*, II. 42-24.
6. सुग्रीवस्य गृहं रम्यं प्रविवेश महाबलः।
   अवार्यमाणः सौमित्रिर्महाभ्रमिव भास्करः।। *Ibid.*, IV. 33-18.
   तं महाभ्रमिवादित्यस्तेजोविस्तृतरश्मिवान्।
   अग्रजस्यातपं वीरः प्रविवेश महाद्युतिः।। *Ibid.*, IV. 10-7.
7. महोदरस्तु संक्रुद्धः कुञ्जरं पर्वतोपमम्।
   भूयः समधिरुह्याशु मन्दरं रश्मिवानिव।। *Ibid.*, VI. 70-124.
8. दृष्ट एव हि नः शोकमपनेष्यति राघवः।
   तमः सर्वस्य लोकस्य समुद्यन्निव भास्करः।। *Ibid.*, II. 83-9.
9. तत्ते ह्यपनयिष्यामि नीहारमिव रश्मिवान्। *Ibid.*, II. 10-40.
10. तस्यादर्शनजः शोकः सुतस्याप्रतिकर्मणः।
    उच्छोषयति वै प्राणान् वारि स्तोकमिवातपः।। *Ibid.*, II. 64-67-68.
11. महीमिमां रश्मिभिरुत्तमप्रभो
    यथा निदाधे भगवान् दिवाकरः। *Ibid.*, II. 43-21.

men, who, by their lustre and brilliance, splendour and dignity, invite comparison with the Sun; anything that shines for any reason whatsoever can be so compared. Thus a king's chariot is often likened to the Sun, probably because of the lavish use of gold and precious stones on it[1]; So is the royal parasol, probably because of its bright colours and round shape[2]; So is a throne, for the same reason perhaps as the chariot[3]; likewise an armour, because it was kept well polished[4]; also ponds owing perhaps to their shiny water[5], and lotuses[6], and palaces[7], and so many other things. Anything in fact and anybody who distinguishes himself and shines out from others of his own kind can be compared to the Sun.

The Moon plays a role similar to that of the Sun, with, of course, some differences. It stands not merely for brilliance and lustre, but also for purity and clearness. Both men and women are compared to the moon whereas, as far as I know, feminine beauty is never compared to the lustre of the Sun. The army, with Rāma as its leader, looked like the autumn night with the moon[8]. Rāma is loved by everybody like the clear moon.

---

1. ततः सूर्यनिकाशेन रथेन महता नरः। *Ibid.,* III. 28-14.
   रथेनादित्यवर्णेन। *Ibid.,* III. 31-34.
   काञ्चनं यानं सूर्यसन्निभम्। *Ibid.,* IV. 38-11.
   तं रथं सूर्यसंकाशम्। *Ibid.,* II. 40-13.
   प्रतपन्तमिवादित्यमन्तरिक्षगतं रथम्। *Ibid.,* II. 5-13.
2. तरुणादित्यसन्निभं छत्रम्। *Ibid.,* III. 5-9.
3. आसीनं सूर्यसंकाशे काञ्चने परमासने। *Ibid.,* III. 32-5.
4. पपात कवचं भूमौ रामस्यादित्यवर्चसम्। *Ibid.,* III. 28-18.
5. तरुणादित्यसंकाशा भान्ति तत्र जलाशयाः। *Ibid.,* IV. 43-41.
6. जले तरुणसूर्याभैः षट्पदाहतकेसरैः।
   पङ्कजैः शोभते पम्पा समन्तादभिसंवृता।। *Ibid.,* IV. 1-64.
7. विरराज च तद्वेश्म रश्मिवानिव रश्मिभिः। *Ibid.,* V. 6-40.
8. सा वीरसमिती राज्ञा विरराज व्यवस्थिता।
   शशिना शुभनक्षत्रा पौर्णमासीव शारदी।। *Ibid.,* VI. 24-1.

Hanumān, with his troop of monkeys, was like the moon with the stars on a clear night[1]. The comparison of a women's face to the moon is so common that it does not call for any special remark. The special connection between the moon and joy and cheerfulness must, however, be mentioned. Kaikeyī was full of gladness like the digit of the autumn moon[2]. The palace became bright with the rays of joy as the sky does with the rays of the autumn moon[3]. Sītā's face in joy shines like the moon, freed from the jaws of Rāhu[4]. The position of the moon as the brightest celestial body, surrounded by a huge collection of less bright stars marks him out for comparison with anybody who shines out among others of his own kind. Daśaratha enters his palace full of beautifully dressed women and resembling Indra's palace, as the Moon enters the sky full of stars[5].

Needless to say that the brightness and rapidity of lightning bring it also frequently into the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. It is also natural that women, with their slim and graceful beauty should be compared to it. These thin, graceful and bright flashes of lightning appear among huge, formless and dark clouds and the contrast did not fail to strike Vālmīki. Also, the wriggling motion of a flash of lightning suggests the idea of a slim beauty trying to get out of the grasp of a giant monster. Vālmīki has made full use of this in his description of Rāvaṇa's ravishment

---

1. गताम्बुदे व्योम्नि विशुद्धमण्डलः
शशीव नक्षत्रगणोपशोभितः। *Ibid.*, IV. 44-16.
2. उत्तस्थौ हर्षसंपूर्णा चन्द्रलेखेव शारदी। *Ibid.*, II. 7-31.
3. हर्षरश्मिभिरुद्द्योतं तस्यान्तः पुरमाबभौ।
शारदस्याभिरामस्य चन्द्रस्येव नभोंऽशुभिः।। ?
4. चारु तद्वदनं तस्यास्ताम्रशुक्लायतेक्षणम्।
अशोभत विशालाक्ष्या राहुमुक्त इवोडुराट्।। *Ibid.*, V. 35-85.
5. व्यदीपयंश्चारु विवेश पार्थिवः
शशीव तारागणसंकुलं नभः। *Ibid.*, II. 5-26.

of Sītā and his flight to Lankā with her[1]. Again, Menakā bathing in the blue waters of the *puṣkara* lake looked like lighting in the cloud[2]. The same image can come wherever there is a combination of bright and dark things. Rāvaṇa sitting in his shining chariot also looks like lightning in a cloud[3]. Hanumān decked with flowers also appears to be a cloud with flashes of lightning[4].

Fire plays more or less the same role as the Sun and the Moon, except that its burning and destructive character often comes out in the images. To it also is compared anything that is brilliant and shining, whether it be an animate or an inanimate object. Sītā is like the flame of a burning fire[4]. So is Ahalyā[5]. Soldiers[6], ascetics[7], Gandharvas[8], plants[9], birds[10], blood[11]- these are some of the things which are compared to fire, either for their lustre and brilliance, or their destructive power. The consuming nature of grief or sorrow marks it out for comparison

---

1. सा पद्मपीता हेमाभा रावणं जनकात्मजा।
   विद्युद्घनमिवाविश्य शुशुभे तप्तभूषणा।। *Ibid.*, III. 52-24.
2. तां ददर्श महातेजा मेनकां कुशिकात्मजः।
   रूपेणाप्रतिमां तत्र (पुष्करेषु) विद्युतं जलदे यथा।। *Ibid.*, I. 1-63-5.
3. कामगं रथमास्थाय शुशुभे राक्षसाधिपः।
   विद्युन्मण्डलवान् मेघः सबालक इवाम्बरे। *Ibid.*, III. 35-10.
4. बभौ मेघ इवोद्यन् वै विद्युद्गणविभूषितः। *Ibid.*, V. 1-52.
5. दीप्तस्येव हुताशस्य शिखा सीता सुमध्यमा। *Ibid.*, III. 37-20.
6. धूमेनाभिपरीताङ्गीं दीप्तामग्निशिखामिव। *Ibid.*, I. 49-14.
7. योधानामग्निकल्पानाम्। *Ibid.*, I. 6-21.
8. अभिवाद्य मुनिश्रेष्ठं ज्वलन्तमिव पावकम्। *Ibid.*, I. 31-3.
9. कोटयस्तत्र चतुर्विंशद्गन्धर्वाणां तपस्विनाम्।
   वसन्त्यग्निनिकाशानां घोराणां पापकर्मणाम्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 42-21, 22.
10. निशि भान्त्यचलेन्द्रस्य हुताशनशिखा इव।
    ओषध्यः स्वप्रभालक्ष्या भ्राजमानाः सहस्रशः।। *Ibid.*, II. 94-21.
11. निपेतुः शोणितादिग्धा धरण्यां पावकोपमाः। *Ibid.*, III. 3-12.

with fire[1] and it is also to fire hidden by ashes that genius or valour in men hidden by their modesty is compared[2].

III

We saw in the preceding section that when Vālmikī has to describe the greatness, dignity and lustre of kings and other great personages, he compares them to the Sun and Moon. But many are the occasions when 'greatness' in the mere physical sense, or 'magnitude' also calls for description. Here, mountains and clouds almost seem to hold the monopoly for acting as standards of comparison. The first object which seems to occur to the poet when he wants to find an analogy for something which is just 'big' is a mountain, a perfectly intelligible comparison and one that is likely to occur to human beings all over the world. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, Vālin and Śugrīva, Rāvaṇa and Kumbhakarṇa, Hanumān and Jaṭāyus, Atikāya and Triśiras–these are some among the many characters of the work who are likened to a mountain.[3] Usually the comparison is of a very simple nature, in which we are just told that somebody big is like a mountain. Sometimes, however, we get details. Vālin is struck by Sugrīva with a Sāla tree as a mountain is struck by

1. मुखं ते प्रेक्ष्य मां शोको दहत्यग्निरिवाश्रयम्।
भृशं मनसि वैदेहि व्यसनारणिसंभवः।। *Ibid.*, II. 104-26.

2. सूचयन्ति परं तेजो भस्मच्छन्नमिवानलम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 11-81.

3. तौ हन्यमानौ नाराचैर्धाराभिरिव पर्वतौ। *Ibid.*, VI. 80-29.
इषुणाभिहतं दृष्टवा बालिनं कुञ्जरोपमम्।
वानरं पर्वतेन्द्राभम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 20-3.
सुभुजं शुक्लदशनं महास्यं पर्वतोपमम् (रावणम्)। *Ibid.*, III. 32-9.
तं दृष्टवा राक्षसश्रेष्ठं पर्वताकारदर्शनम् (कुम्भकर्णम्)। *Ibid.*, VI. 61-2.
ततो हनूमान् गिरिसन्निकाशः
कृताञ्जलिस्तामभिवाद्य वृद्धाम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 50-40.
ततः पर्वतशृङ्गाभस्तीक्ष्णतुण्डः खगोत्तमः। *Ibid.*, III. 50-2.
(अतिकायः) शृङ्गाभ्यामिव तुङ्गाभ्यां हिमवान् पर्वतोपमः। *Ibid.*, VI. 71-23.
अभ्यद्रवद्रणे रामं (त्रिशिराः) त्रिशृङ्ग इव पर्वतः। *Ibid.*, III. 27.7.

'vajra' Lakṣmaṇa, with three arrows striking out of his forehead, looked like a mountain with three peaks[1]. It is not only living beings who are compared to mountains for their size; a host of other things are so compared. Thus, houses and palaces are usually likened to peaks of mountains, either for their size or for the closely connected conception of height. The palaces of all kings, no matter whether they are men, monkeys or merely, Rākṣasas, are equally honoured in this manner[2]. That elephants, of all animals, should be compared to mountains is not likely to cause surprise in anybody[3]. Equally natural is the comparison of clouds with mountains[4]. In fact the connection between mountains and clouds is so close that they seem almost interchangeable in most of the images of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. About this, however, more will be said later. Waves in the sea are also likened to mountains[5], which is also quite intelligible. When the poet says that the trees, with smoke clinging to their tops, look like *"Vaidūrya"* hills covered with clouds[6], we must recognize

---

1. गात्रेष्वभिहतो वाली वज्रेणेव महागिरिः। *Ibid.*, IV. 16-23.
   तैः पृषत्कैर्ललाटस्थैः शुशुभे रघुनन्दनः।
   रणाग्रे समरश्लाघी त्रिशृंग इव पर्वतः।। *Ibid.*, VI. 91-34.

2. स तु वेश्म पुनर्मातुः कैलासशिखरप्रभम्। *Ibid.*, II. 39-27.
   गृहैश्च गिरिसंकाशैः शारदाम्बुदसन्निभैः। *Ibid.*, V. 2.16.
   विन्ध्यमेरुगिरिप्रख्यैः प्रासादैः। *Ibid.*, IV. 33.8.
   शुक्लैः प्रासादशिखरैः कैलासशिखरोपमैः। *Ibid.*, IV. 33.15.
   मेरुशृङ्गसमं सूतो राजवेश्म ददर्श ह। *Ibid.*, II. 15.37.

3. वारणैरवमृद्यन्ते मामकैः पर्वतोपमैः। *Ibid.*, II. 99.3
   गजैः पर्वतकूटाभैः। *Ibid.*, III. 25.10.
   नागाश्च गिरिसन्निभाः। *Ibid.*, II. 16.34.
   गजा मदोत्कटाः शूराश्चलन्त इव पर्वताः।

4. संपश्य त्वं नभो मेघैः संवृतं गिरिसन्निभैः। *Ibid.*, IV. 28.2.

5. मेरुमंदरसंकाशान् उद्गतान् सुमहार्णवे।
   अत्यक्रामन् महावेगांस्तरङ्गान् गणयन्निव।। *Ibid.*, V. 1.70.

6. एते वृक्षाः प्रकाशन्ते धूमसंसक्तमस्तकाः।
   मेघजालप्रतिच्छन्ना वैदूर्यगिरयो यथा।। *Ibid.*, IV. 13.24.

that something more than mere size is the basis of comparison. There is also the green colour of the tree which has called forth the analogy with the tree. When the *'parigha'* or the 'club' is compared to a mountain-peak[1], perhaps mere magnitude is the basis of the comparison. The same is the case where heaps of food are likened to mountains[2].

While elephants are compared to mountains on account of their huge size, they themselves can become standards of comparison in the matter of magnitude[3]. In all these images, figuring mountains, the ranges and peaks usually mentioned are Kailāsa, Meru, Mandara, Vindhya and Himālaya.

As was pointed out above, clouds play a part in Sanskrit imagery very similar to that of mountain[4], except that the poet seems to be conscious not only of their size, but also of their colour, dark or white according to the season of the year. That is why it is chiefly monkeys and Rākṣasas, in whom size and colour are equally remarkable, who are usually compared to clouds. Usually the comparison is a very simple one, but sometimes it becomes more picturesque. Vālin, with his garland round his

---

1. जग्राह गिरिशृङ्गाभं परिधं लोमहर्षणम्। *Ibid.*, III. 26-10.
2. अन्नकूटाश्च दृश्यन्ते बहवः पर्वतोपमाः। *Ibid.*, I. 14-15.
3. वानरान् द्विरदप्रख्यान्। *Ibid.*, IV. 13.11
   वालिनं कुञ्जरोपमम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 20.2.
4. अञ्जनाम्बुदसंकाशाः कुञ्जरेन्द्रमहौजसः।
   अञ्जने पर्वते चैव ये वसन्ति प्लवंगमाः।। *Ibid.*, IV. 37.5.
   सपर्वतवनाकाशां दक्षिणां हरिवाहिनी।
   छादयन्ती ययौ भीमा द्यामिवाम्बुदसंततिः।। *Ibid.*, VI. 4.58.
   ते (राक्षसाः) वलाहकसंकाशा महाकाया महाबलाः। *Ibid.*, III. 25.9.
   इति प्रतिसमादिष्टा राक्षसास्ते चतुर्दश।
   तत्र जग्मुस्तया सार्धे घना वातेरिता यथा। *Ibid.*, III. 19.26.
   ततो नीलाम्बुदप्रख्यः प्रहस्तो नाम राक्षसः। *Ibid.*, VI. 8.1.
   नीलजीमूतसंकाशस्तप्तप्रकाञ्चनकुण्डलः। *Ibid.*, III. 38.2.

neck looks like a cloud tinged by the red glow of the evening[1]. Sugrīva with his garland looks like the evening cloud with its string of *balāka* birds[2]. Rāvaṇa smeared with sandal paste, looks like a cloud with lightning[3]. In all this, not merely the size and colour of the cloud, but the colour of the garlands or sandal paste also suggests the image. Many are the passages where houses and palaces are likened to clouds, but here it is the white autumn clouds which are usually mentioned, they being more appropriate for tall white-washed buildings, having many stories[4]. Among other objects compared to clouds are forest ranges[5], or groves of trees, which can produce the illusion of clouds, especially when they are at a distance, a line of smoke[6], from its very obvious resembalance to a mass of clouds, elephants[7] and finally, mountains themselves[8]. The identification of cloud and mountain is deep-rooted and universal among human beings, as the study of Indo-Europeon language shows.

---

1. स (वाली) तया मालया वीरो हैमया हरियूथपः।
सन्ध्यानुगतपर्यन्तः पयोधर इवाभवत्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 17.6.

2. स तया शुशुभे श्रीमांल्लतया कण्ठ सक्तया।
मालयेव बलाकानां ससन्ध्य इव तोयदः।। *Ibid.*, IV. 12.41.

3. लोहितेतानुलिसाङ्गं चन्दनेन सुगन्धिना।
सन्ध्यारक्तमिवाकाशं तोयदं सतडिद्रणम्।। *Ibid.*, V. 10.8.

4. स गृहैरभ्रसंकाशैः पाण्डुरैरुपशोभितम्। *Ibid.*, II. 17.2.
सिताभ्रशिखरप्रख्यं प्रासादमधिरुह्य च। *Ibid.*, II. 5.22.
सिताभ्रशिखराभ्रेषु देवतायतनेषु च। *Ibid.*, II. 6.11.

5. एतत्प्रकाशते दूरान्नीलमेघनिभं वनम्। *Ibid.*, II. 93.8.
वनं महामेघनिभं प्रविष्टो द्रुमैर्महद्भिर्विविधैरुपेतम्। *Ibid.*, III. 3.26.
एष मेघ इवाकाशे वृक्षषण्डः प्रकाशते। *Ibid.*, IV. 13.14.

6. एतञ्च वनमध्यस्थं कृष्णाभ्रशिखरोपमम्।
पावकस्याश्रमस्थस्य धूमाग्रं संप्रदृश्यते। *Ibid.*, III. 11.51.

7. वारणैश्च चतुर्दन्तैः श्वेताभ्रनिचयोपमैः। *Ibid.*, V. 4.28.

8. पर्वतांश्चाभ्रसन्निभान्। *Ibid.*, III. 11.45.

Whether the standard of comparison be the Sun or the Moon, Mountain or cloud, it seems to describe only the general aspect of a person or thing. There are, however, the details to be considered, especially in the case of persons. The work abounds, in images descriptive of the different parts of the body of men, monkeys and demons. The following table will show at a glance the objects to which the different parts of the body are compared.

Object compared	***Standard of comparison***
Colour of person-	blue lotus, cloud, *Vaidūrya*, *anjaña* (dark persons); molten gold[1].
Face	Moon, lotus, sun, coral[2].
Eyes	Lotus, fire, copper, *alāta*, blood, deer's eyes, Sun[3].

---

1. इन्दीवरश्यामः। *Ibid.*, II. 89.19;
मेघश्यामं महाबाहुम् (रामम्)। *Ibid.* II. 83.8;
स्निग्धवैदूर्यसंकाशः (रावणः)। *Ibid.* III. 35.8;
भिन्नाञ्जनचयश्यामः। *Ibid.* VI. 45.14;
तप्तकाञ्चनवर्णाभा। *Ibid.* III. 34.17;
सुग्रीवो हेमपिङ्गलः। *Ibid.* IV. 14.9.

2. राकाशशिनिभाननः। *Ibid.* III. 31.16;
सदृशं शारदस्येन्दोः फुल्लस्य कमलस्य च। *Ibid.* II. 64.70;
विद्रुमप्रतिमाननः (हनुमान्)। *Ibid.* V. 33.2.

3. कमलपत्राक्षीम् (कैकेयीम्)। *Ibid.* II. 10.27;
कमलपत्राक्षः (रामः)। *Ibid.* II. 13.9;
चक्षुषानलकल्पेन। *Ibid.* III. 11.66;
विनिःश्वस्य स ताम्राक्षः क्रुद्धो नाग इव श्वसन्। *Ibid.* II. 92.28;
अलातसदृशेक्षणा। *Ibid.* III. 18.17;
क्षतजसमे नयने। *Ibid.* IV. 35.23;
क्षतजोपमाक्षः। *Ibid.* IV. 24.31;
मृगशावाक्षीम्। *Ibid.* III. 18.17;
नवार्कोदितताम्रचक्षुः *Ibid.* VI. 59.17.

Tresses	Black cobra, line of forests[1].
Lips.	Copper[2].
Neck	Colour of sandal[3].
Shoulders	Bull's, lion's[4].
Breasts	Ripe *Tāla* fruits, *Bilva* fruits[5].
Arms	Blot, elephant's trunk, Indra's banner[6].
Hands	Five-headed snakes, Indra's banner, lotus[7].
Thighs	Elephant's trunk, plantain tree[8].
Voice	Cloud, *Dundubhi, Kalahanisa*[9].
Gaze	Lion
Tears	Crystal[10]

1. नीलनागाभया वेण्या। *Ibid.*, V. 14.25;
   नीलया नीरदापाये वनराज्या महीमिव। *Ibid.*, V. 14.25.
2. चारुताम्रोष्ठम्। *Ibid.*, III. 52.21.
3. चन्दनवर्णाभा ग्रीवा (सीतायाः)। *Ibid.*, III. 60.32.
4. सिंहवृषस्कन्धः। *Ibid.*, IV. 53.7.
5. पक्वतालोपमस्तनी। *Ibid.*, III. 60.18;
   बिल्वोपमस्तनी। *Ibid.*, III. 60.13.
6. परिघायतबाहवः। *Ibid.*, III. 5.16;
   वृत्तौ करिकरोपमौ। *Ibid.*, V. 13.18;
   भुजाविन्द्रध्वजोपमौ। *Ibid.*, V. 10.15.
7. पञ्चशीर्षौपरिवोरगैः। *Ibid.*, V. 50.8.
8. ऊरून् करिकरोपमान्। *Ibid.*, III. 25.22;
   कदलीकाण्डसदृशौ। *Ibid.*, III. 62.4.
9. ननाद विविधान् नादान् यथा प्रावृषि तोयदः। *Ibid.*, III. 18.23;
   दुन्दुभिस्वनम्। *Ibid.*, I. 16.12;
   सबाष्पकलया वाचा कलहंसस्वरो युवा। *Ibid.*, I. 82.10.
10. तस्याः स्फटिकसंकाशं वारि संतापसंभवम्। *Ibid.*, II. 30.24.

Gait Proud tiger's, Intoxicated elephant's, Bull's[1].

All this relates only to the description of the purely external aspect of persons and things, without any reference to their feelings or their relation to one another. Such description is not, however, the chief interest of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which abounds, as was said before, in pictures of men and women, under the stress of deep feelings or in their relation to one another. The work is, after all, a narrative of the actions of men and women. We have so far seen what kind of images are used by Vālmīki in his description of kings and princes in all their royal dignity and splendour. We have also seen that the same images recur also in the description of other things at their best. But persons and things do not always remain at their best. In a state of distress, they lose their former lustre and glory. Let us see what images are used by the poet in describing things in this state. It is only natural that in a story in which the fortunes of men and things change so frequently according to circumstances, there should be descriptions of them in their fallen state also. Indeed one is struck by the extraordinary variety of the things to which men and things in such a state are compared. Nor are these images scattered throughout the work. Sometimes, as in the description of Sītā in distress, a large number of them occur in the same passage, lending extraordinary force to the emotion which is meant to be conveyed. Such images are grouped together in the following paragraph for the reader's convenience. Such images are mostly found in the description of Sītā in her sorrow, either before or after her ravishment by Rāvaṇa. In such a state, we

---

1. दृप्तशार्दूलविक्रमम् । *Ibid.*, I. 16.12;
सिंहविक्रान्तगामिनम् । *Ibid.*, II. 92.21;
वृषभश्रेष्ठविक्रमौ । *Ibid.*, IV. 3.10.

are told she looked like the Sun in eclipse[1], or without its lustre, or the Moon in day-time[2], or moonlight covered by clouds[3], or a fallen star[4], or a lotus-stalk soiled by mud[5], or a lotus-bed squashed[6], or a lotus without its stalk[7], or a lotus fading in the Sun[8], or a creeper without flower[9], or the fallen branch of a tree[10], or a deer gone astray[11], or deer followed by dogs[12], or a Śārikā in a cage[13], or a female elephant separated from its mate[14], or a *Cakravākī* without its mate[15], or gold covered by dust[16], or a boat in the middle of the ocean, buffeted by the winds[17], or the altar soiled[18], or an army with dead heroes[19], or Hope baffled[20], or Prosperity vanished[21], or Faith

---

1. अनन्या राघवेणाहं भास्करेण यथा प्रभा। *Ibid.*, V. 21.15.
2. शुशुभे न विना रामं दिवा चन्द्र इवोदितः। *Ibid.*, III. 51.22.
3. प्रभां नक्षत्रराजस्य कालमेघैरिवावृताम्। *Ibid.*, V. 15.37.
4. क्षीणपुण्यां च्युतां भूमौ तारां निपतितामिव। *Ibid.*, V. 17.20.

5-6. मृणाली पङ्कदिग्धेव। *Ibid.*, V. 17.25;
पदिमनीमिव विध्वस्ताम्। *Ibid.*, V. 19.13.

7. न रराज विना रामं विनालमिव पङ्कजम्। *Ibid.*, III. 52.18.

8-9. पद्ममातपसंतप्तम्। *Ibid.*, II. 104.25;
लतामकुसुमामिव। *Ibid.*, V. 17.25.

10. छिन्नां प्रपतितां भूमौ शाखामिव वनस्पतेः। *Ibid.*, V. 19.5.
11. वने यूथपरिभ्रष्टा मृगी कोकैरिवार्दिता। *Ibid.*, V. 25.5.
12. मृगयूथपरिभ्रष्टां मृगीं श्वभिरिवावृताम्। *Ibid.*, III. 55.5.
13. पञ्जरस्थेव शारिका। *Ibid.*, V. 13.13;
यूथपेन विना कृताम्।
14. निःश्वसन्तीं सुदुःखार्तीं गजराजवधूमिव। *Ibid.*, V. 19.18.
15. सहचररहितेव चक्रवाकी। *Ibid.*, V. 16.30.
16. काञ्चनं रजसा ध्वस्तम्। *Ibid.*, II. 104.25.
17. वायुवेगैरिवाक्रान्तां मज्जन्तीं नावमर्णवे। *Ibid.*, III. 55.4.
18. वेदीमिव परामृष्टाम्। *Ibid.*, V. 19.14.
19. हतवीरां चमूमिव। *Ibid.*, V. 19.13.
20. आशां प्रतिहतामिव। *Ibid.*, V. 15.33;
21. ऋद्धिं निपतितामिव। *Ibid.*, V. 15.33.

destroyed[1], or an Order disobeyed[2], or the Future imperilled[3], or Wisdom in decay[4], or *Smṛti* in doubt[5], or learning acquired on *Pratipad*[6]. Similarly, Ayodhyā without Rāma and Daśaratha, is like the sky without the Sun[7], or the Moon or the stars[8], or like the sky covered by clouds[9], or the night without the Moon[10], or the ocean without water[11], or a river with little water[12], or like a sinking wave of the ocean[13], or a tank without flowers, or a cow deserted by the bull[15], or a cave without its lion, or a deserted tavern[16], or a string of pearls without any precious stone in it[17], or a creeper fading under the fire[18]. Daśaratha in deep sorrow is like a *Ṛṣi* who had lied[19], or fallen Yayāti, or a tank without water[24], or a snake without its power[20].

1-2. श्रद्धामिव विमानिताम्। *Ibid.*, V. 19.11.
आशां प्रतिहतामिव। *Ibid.*, V. 19.12.

3-4. आयतीमिव विध्वस्ताम्। *Ibid.*, V. 19.12.
प्रज्ञामिव परिक्षीणाम्। *Ibid.*, V. 19.11.

5-6. तां स्मृतीमिव संदिग्धाम्। *Ibid.*, V. 15.34.
प्रतिपत्पाठशीलस्य विद्येव तनुतां गता। *Ibid.*, V. 59.32.

7. गतप्रभा द्यौरिव भास्करं विना। *Ibid.*, II. 66.28.

8. चन्द्रहीनमिवाकाशम्। *Ibid.*, II. 48.18;
नष्टतारमिवाम्बरम्। *Ibid.*, II. 48.35.

9. प्रच्छन्नशशिनक्षत्रां द्यामिवाम्बुधरैर्युताम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.13.

10. निष्प्रभा त्वयि निष्क्रान्ते गतचन्द्रेव शर्वरी। *Ibid.*, II. 53.29.

11-12. तोयहीनमिवार्णवम्। *Ibid.*, II. 48.18;
अल्पोष्णक्षुब्धसलिलाम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.4.

13. प्रशान्तमारुतोद्धूतां जलोर्मिमिव निःस्वनाम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.7.

14. गोवृषेण परित्यक्तां गवां पत्नीमिवोत्सुकाम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.9.

15. हतशौण्डामिव ध्वस्तां पानभूमिमसंस्कृताम्। *Ibid.*, II. 114.4.

16. वियुक्तां मणिभिर्जात्यैर्नवां मुक्तावलीमिव। *Ibid.*, II. 114.10.

17. द्रुतदावाग्निविप्लुष्टां क्लान्तां वनलतामिव। *Ibid.*, II. 114.12.

18. उक्तानृतमृषिं यथा। *Ibid.*, II. 18.6;

19. तटाकमिव निस्तोयम्। *Ibid.*, II. 34.3.

20. हततेजा यथा सर्पो बभूव जगतीपतिः। *Ibid.*, II. 12.54.

Kaikeyī fallen on the floor in deep sorrow looked like creeper that has been cut, or a fallen goddess, or a fallen Kinnarī, or a fallen Apsaras, or *Māyā* gone astray, or a deer imprisoned, or a female elephant wounded by a hunter[1]. Prostrate Rāma is like fire without lustre, or the setting Sun, or the Moon in eclipse[2]. When wounded and covered with flood, he is like the sun surrounded by the evening clouds. Defeated Viśvāmitra looked like the ocean without its velocity, or a serpent with broken fangs, or the sun in eclipse or a bird without wings[3]. A kingdom without a king is like a river without water, forest without grass, cows without a keeper[4]. A kingdom devoid of its wealth is like wine without fermentation. A kingdom enjoyed by another is like wine robbed of its essence, a sacrifice without Soma[5]. An army without generals is like a boat without oars. When it is in a state of depression, it is like a ship on the sea when there is no wind[6].

1. लतामिव विनिष्कृत्तां पतितां देवतामिव।
किन्नरीमिव निर्धूतां च्युतामप्सरसं यथा।
मायामिव परिभ्रष्टां हरिणीमिव संयताम्।
करेणुमिव दिग्धेन विद्धां मृगयुना वने। *Ibid.*, II. 10.24-26.

2. विलापोपरतं रामं गतार्चिषमिवानलम्। *Ibid.*, II. 53.28.
भास्करोऽस्तमिव व्रजन्। *Ibid.*, 6. 49.15.
परिपूर्णः शशी काले ग्रहेणोपप्लुतो यथा। *Ibid.*, II. 40.30.
स विद्धः क्षतजैर्दिग्धः सर्वगात्रेषु राघवः।
बभूव रामः सन्ध्याभ्रैर्दिवाकर इवावृतः।। *Ibid.*, III. 25.15.

3. समुद्र इव निर्वेगो भग्नदंष्ट्र इवोरगः।
उपरक्त इवादित्यः सद्यो निष्प्रभतां गतः।।
लूनपक्ष इव द्विजः। *Ibid.*, I. 55.9.

4. यथा ह्यनुदका नद्यो यथा वाप्यतृणं वनम्।
अंगोपाला यथा गावस्तया राष्ट्रमराजकम्।। *Ibid.*, II. 67.29.

5. राज्यं गतधनं साधो पीतमण्डां सुरामिव। *Ibid.*, II. 36.12;
तथा ह्यात्तमिदं राज्यं हृतसारां सुरामिव।
नाभिमन्तुमलं रामो नष्टसोममिवाध्वरम्।। *Ibid.*, II. 61.18.

6. सेवा भ्रमति संख्येषु हतकर्णेव नौर्जले। *Ibid.*, VI. 48.26.
किमिव व्यथिता सेना मूढवातेव नौर्जले। *Ibid.*, VI. 50.1.

Vālin, lying on the floor after having been struck by Rāma looked like the sky without the Moon, or the Sun fallen on the earth at the end of a *Yuga* or Yayāti fallen on earth[1]. When struck by Sugrīva with a Sāla tree, he looked like an over crowded boat on the ocean[2]. Bharata, lying on the floor in sorrow, on hearing of Rāma's exile, looked like the sun at the end of a *Yuga*[3]. He and Śatrughna, prostrate, seemed to be two bulls with broken horns[4].

On examining the above lists, one finds that the same images are sometimes used to characterize more than one thing in a fallen state, while others occur in the case of particular persons and things only. Thus, Sītā, Ayodhyā and Kausalyā, all look like a fallen star, in a state of lost glory. Sītā, without Rāma, and Ayodhyā without Rāma are both like an army with dead heroes. From this, can we draw the conclusion that all these images are interchangeable ? Can we imagine Vālmīki saying that Sītā in distress is like a lake devoid of its snakes ? This is said, in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, in connection with the palace without Rāma[5]. It is found in the *Mahābhārata* also, where it is used to describe Duryodhana's tent[7] ? A palace and a tent are both places of residence and one can, therefore, understand why the image occurs in both cases. We are, perhaps, justified in declaring that Vālmīki would not have used the comparison in describing Sītā.

---

1. नष्टचन्द्रमिव व्योम। *Ibid.*, IV. 17.3;
आदित्यमिव कालेन युगान्ते भुवि पातितम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 17.10;
ययातिमिव पुण्यान्ते देवलोकादिह च्युतम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 17.9.
2. गुरुभारसमाक्रान्ता नौः ससार्थेव सागरे। *Ibid.*, IV. 16.24.
3. ददर्श रामो दुर्दर्शे युगान्ते भास्करं यथा।
4. धरायां स्म व्यचेष्टेतां भग्नशृङ्गाविवर्षभौ। *Ibid.*, II. 78.20.
5. महाह्रदमिवाक्षोभ्यं सुपर्णेन हृतोरगम्। *Ibid.*, II. 42.25.
6. गतोत्सवं पुरमिव हतनागमिव ह्रदम्। M. Bh. IX. 63.5.

Mention has already been made in the preceding part of the occurrence of some of these images in the *Mahābhārata*. A few more might be mentioned here to indicate the similarity in spirit of the two epics. Damayantī in distress is like a lotus-bed spoiled, or a lotus stalk pulled out, or a louts-bed smeared with mud or the full-moon night with the moon in eclipse, or the moon covered by black clouds, or the sun surrounded by smoke, or a dried up river[1]. Kārṇa's face in like a lotus spoilt by rain water, or fallen on the ground[2]. The army of the Kurus without Bhīṣma is like the sky without stars, or the sky without wind[3]. The Kāmyaka wood is like an empty wine jar, or a lake without snakes[4].

The above images culled from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* incidentally tell us what were the attributes which in the popular imagination, were always associated with certain things whose absence took away all glory and lustre from them. This invariable association is explicitly mentioned by the poet in some places. Sītā says, she would not deviate from *Dharma*, anymore than light can be separated from the moon[5]. Rāma

---

1. व्याकुलामिव पदिमनीम्। *M. Bh.* III. 65.20.
   मृणालीमिव चोद्धृतम्। *Ibid.*, III. 65.21.
   मलपङ्कानुलिप्ताङ्गीं प्रम्लानां नलिनीमिव। *Ibid.*, III. 65.18.
   पौर्णमासीमिव निशां राहुग्रस्तनिशाकराम्। *Ibid.*, III. 65.19.
   चन्द्रलेखामिव नवां व्योम्नि नीलाभ्रसंवृताम्। *Ibid.*, III. 65.22.
   निबद्धां धूमजालेन प्रभामिव विभावसोः। *Ibid.*, III. 65.13.
   कृशस्रोतां नदीमिव। *Ibid.*, III. 65.19.
2. बभौ वर्षाम्बुविक्लिलं पदमागलितं यथा। *Ibid.*, I. 146.35.
3. द्यौरिवापेतनक्षत्रा हीनं स्वमिव वायुना। *Ibid.*, VII. 1.26.
4. सरः सुपर्णेन हृतोरगेन्द्रमराजकं राष्ट्रमिहेव शान्तम्।
   एवंविधं मे प्रतिभाति काम्यकं शौण्डैर्यथा पीतसुरश्च कुम्भः।।
   Ibid., III. 270.5.
5. धर्माद्विचलितुं नाहमलं चन्द्रादिव प्रभा। *Rāmā* II. 39.28.

does not give up his cheerfulness as the autumn moon its lustre. He does not disregard his fathers' order as the moon does not abandon its lustre[1]. Sugrīva helping Rāma is as natural as that the moon should shed its lustre, or that the sun should make the sky bright or that Indra should give rain[2]. The indissoluble association of husband and wife is like that of *Vīṇā* and string, chariot and wheel[3].

Closely allied to the description of how men and things looked in a state of faded lustre and greatness are pictures of what they do in sorrow. As shedding tears is the most common action of men and women in sorrow, it is often described. Kausalyā sheds tears as a canal brings fresh water[4], tears from Sītā's eyes took like drops of water from a lotus[5]. Sugrīva held in check a flood of tears which came to him like a flood in a river[6]. Rāma was choked with tears as the moon with snow[7]. Tears of joy also sometimes enter into images as when we are told that Kausalyā will shed tears of joy as a line of clouds showers water[8]. In sorrow, people not only weep, they also sometime collapse. Daśaratha, Rāma and many others fall on the floor

---

1. नाजहात् पितुरादेशं शशी ज्योत्स्नामिवोदितः। *Ibid.*, II. 82.6.
2. यदिन्द्रो वर्षते वर्षे न तत्चित्रं भविष्यति।
   आदित्योऽसौ सहस्रांशुः कुर्याद्वितिमिरं नभः।।
   चन्द्रमा रजनीं कुर्यात् प्रभया सौम्यनिर्मलाम्।
   त्वद्विधो वापि मित्राणां प्रीतिं कुर्यात् परंतप।। *Ibid.*, IV. 39.2-4.
3. नातन्त्री विद्यते वीणा नाचक्रो विद्यते रथः। *Ibid.*, II. 39.28.
4. कौसल्या व्यसृजद्बाष्पं प्रणालीव नवोदकम्। *Ibid.*, II. 62.10.
5. पुण्डरीकलताशाभ्यां धिप्रकीर्णमिवोदकम्। *Ibid.*, V. 33.4.
6. वाष्पवेगं तु सहसा नदीवेगमिवागतम्।
   धारयामास धैर्येण सुग्रीवो रामसन्निधौ।। *Ibid.*, IV. 8.30.
7. अभवद्बाष्पसंरुद्धो नीहारेणेव चन्द्रमाः। *Ibid.*, IV. 6.6.
8. मुदाश्रु मोक्ष्यसे क्षिप्रं मेघरेखेव वार्षिकी। *Ibid.*, II. 44.27.
   निकृतमिव सालस्य स्कन्धं परशुना वने। *Ibid.*, II. 72.22.

in their sorrow and the normal analogy is that of a tree that has been cut down[1]. Of Śūrpaṇakhā, we are told that she fell like a thunder-bolt from the sky[2]. In great sorrow, the heart breaks like the banks of a great river flooded in the rainy season[3]. To the wriggling motion of a snake on the ground is compared the wallowing on the ground of one in extreme agony[4].

The Rāmāyaṇa contains more than mere exhibitions of sorrow. Battles occupy quite a large portion of the work with all their implications of courage and fear, anger and calm; fights take place in all *Kāṇḍās,* except perhaps in the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, while the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* is full of them. Courage is the basis of all fights and those who possess it are compared usually to Indra and Viṣṇu[5], who are famous for their *vīrya*, in the Vedas. More unusual and therefore, interesting are comparisons with Yama and Vāyu for *vīrya*'[6]. If Indra and Viṣṇu are the models of courage, it is the deer which stands for fear. The followers of Khara run away like the deer terrified by the hunters[7]. It is not merely cowards in battle who are compared to terror-stricken deer. When Sītā sees the cloth made of bark which she has to wear before going to the forest, she becomes terrified like a deer when it sees the net which is meant to catch it[8]. If the deer is the type of the victim of fear, it is the snake which represents the cause of fear. People fear a liar as they

---

1. निपपातैष दुःखेन कृत्तमूल इव द्रुमः। *Ibid.*, II. 40.36.
2. पपात भूमौ गगनाद् यथाशनिः। *Ibid.*, III. 18.25.
3. प्रावृषीव महानद्या स्पृष्टकूलं नवाम्भता *Ibid.*, II. 21.49.
   अयमात्मभवः शोको मामनाथामचेतसम्।
   संसाधयति वेगेन यथाकूलं नदीरयः।। *Ibid.*, II. 64.74-75.
4. हा नाथेति विनर्दन्ती सर्पवत्र्वेष्टसे क्षितौ। *Ibid.*, III. 21.4.
5. यमशक्रमसो वीर्ये बृहस्पतिसमो मतौ। *Ibid.*, II. 1.39;
   अहो वीर्यमहो दाढर्ये विष्णोरिव हि दृश्यते। *Ibid.*, III. 30.32.
6. पवनसमानविक्रमाः प्लवगवराः। *Ibid.*, IV. 63.15.
7. द्रवन्ति स्म न तिष्ठन्ति व्याघ्रत्रस्ता मृगा इव। *Ibid.*, III. 27.20.
8. संप्रेक्ष्य वीरं संत्रस्ता पृषती वागुरामिव। *Ibid.*, III. 37.9.

do a snake[1]. Rāma became terrified on seeing Daśaratha in distress as one does on touching a snake with the feet[2].

Coming back to matters relating to war, an army is compared to an ocean when its size and density are to be emphasized and to masses of clouds when its massive, noisy character is to be brought out[3]. Or such an army, bows and arrows are the chief weapons. The usual comparison of an arrow is with a snake, probably because of its long shape, its quick motion accompanied by its hissing sound and finally its fatal character[4]. In one passage, the common points mentioned are the sharp points and the joints *(ṛjuparvaṇaḥ)*. Sometimes the comparison is with a thunderbolt, or fire, or lightning, or noose of death, or the Sun[5]. The spear is like Indra's banner, or the thunderbolt[6]. Daggers are like serpents[7]. Slaps and blows with

---

1. उद्विजन्ते यथा सर्पान्नरादनृतवादिनः। *Ibid.*, II. 109.12.
2. रामोऽपि भयमापन्नः पदात् स्पष्ट्वे पन्नगम्। *Ibid.*, II. 18.4.
3. महतीयमितः सेवा सागराभा प्रदृश्यते। *Ibid.*, II. 84.2;
   सागरौघनिमा सेना भरतस्य महात्मनः। *Ibid.*, II. 93.4;
   धृतनानाप्रहरणं गम्भीरं सागरोपमम्। *Ibid.*, III. 24.32;
   सागरौघनिभं भीमं तद्वानरबलं महत्। *Ibid.*, VI. 4.39;
   प्रावृट्काले यथा मेघा नर्दमानाः सविद्युतः। *Ibid.*, VI. 53.12;
   महीं संच्छादयामास प्रावृषि द्यामिवाम्बुदः। *Ibid.*, II. 93.4;
   जीमूता इव घर्मान्ते सघोषाः संप्रतिस्थिरे। *Ibid.*, II. 92.34.
4. शरानाशीविषोपमान्। *Ibid.*, III. 27.13;
   क्रुद्धानाशीविषानिव। *Ibid.*, III. 28.4;
   दीप्तान् क्षिपति नाराचान् सर्पानिव महाविषान् *Ibid.*, III. 34.7;
   जीवितान्तकरैर्घोरैर्ज्वलद्भिरिव पन्नगैः।
   तीक्ष्णाग्रऋजुपर्वाणः सरोषा भुजगा इव।। *Ibid.*, IV. 5.28.
5. विधूमा इव पावकाः। *Ibid.*, III. 26.30;
   चापस्य रूपं विद्युद्रणोपमम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 30.74;
   कालपाशोपमम्। *Ibid.*, III. 25.17;
   नाराचान् सूर्यसन्निभान्। *Ibid.*, III. 20.18.
6. स विनद्य महानादं शूलं शक्रध्वजोपमम्। *Ibid.*, III. 3.14.
7. खड्गावेते विराजेते निर्मुक्तभुजगाविव। *Ibid.*, IV. 3.19.

fists are like thunderbolts[1]. When the fighters fall in battle, they fall usually like trees cut down or struck by lightning or like Indra's banner or like a mountain struck by thunderbolt[2]. Śūrpaṇakhā rushes at Rāma as Rāhu at the Moon[3]. When one rushes at another only to be destroyed, it is like a moth rushing at fire[4]. Two mighty soldiers fighting with each other is like the clash of clouds, or like the meeting of a lion and an elephant, or like the battle between Vṛtra and Vāsava, or between Budha and Angāraka[5]. It is clear from all this that the imagery of war, as all other imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa,* is mainly derived from nature and mythology.

IV

We may now turn from war and battle to things more homely. The *Rāmāyaṇa* is justly famous for descriptions of the tender side of life, love, loyalty and devotion. In the midst of elaborate description of fights are to be found many scenes drawn from family life. The main theme of the work is, after all, the dutifulness of Rāma as a son and the devotion and loyalty of Sitā as a wife. These are not, however, the only human emotions

---

1. तप्तैरशनिकल्पैश्च। *Ibid.,* IV. 12.18;
   वज्रकल्पैश्च मुष्टिभिः। *Ibid.,* IV. 12.18.
2. पपात सहसा भूमौ छिन्नमूल इव द्रुमः। *Ibid.,* VI. 58.54;
   पपात वज्राभिहतो यथाद्रिः। *Ibid.,* VI. 70.28;
   अपतद्देवराजस्य मुक्तरश्मिरिव ध्वजः। *Ibid.,* IV. 17.2.
3. अभ्यगच्छत् सुसंक्रुद्धा महोल्का रोहिणीमिव। *Ibid.,* III. 18.17;
   राममेवाभिदुद्राव राहुश्चन्द्रमसं यथा। *Ibid.,* III. 27.20.
4. आससादाथ ते रामं पतंग इव पावकम्। *Ibid.,* V. 42.27.
5. बभूव वातोद्धतयोर्मेघयोर्गगने यथा। *Ibid.,* III. 51.2;
   संबभूवातिबलिनोः सिंहकुञ्जरयोरिव। *Ibid.,* III. 27.10.
   वृत्रवासवयोरिव। *Ibid.,* IV. 16.29;
   गगने ग्रहयोर्घोरं बुधाङ्गारकयोरिव। *Ibid.,* IV. 12.17.

which form the subject of Vālmīki's picturesque descriptions. Sometimes it is friendship, or the King's solicitude for his subjects, or the latter's loyalty to the former. At other times, it is a brother's devotion or a sister's love which calls forth the latent powers of the poet. Let us begin by examining the images which occur in Vālmīki's description of love between man and woman and all that may be connected with it, for this subject assumes immense importance in later Sanskrit *Kāvya* literature, where its treatment can be better understood if one keeps in mind Vālmīki's way of dealing with it.

Love images come in the *Rāmāyaṇa* in two ways : indirectly, *i.e.*, when things are described in terms of love or the fair sex; directly, when the feelings of people who love each other are described. Students of Sanskrit literature know how the tendency exhibited in the former way becomes fully developed in later times and yields to the reader some of the best images ever known in Sanskrit. The *Rāmāyaṇa* gives us some of the earliest specimens of such images.

It is rather interesting to note how a river and a woman are intimately connected in the poet's imagination. In autumn, we are told, the course of rivers, which exhibit girdles in the form of lines of fishes, is rather slow, like that of women early in the morning when they are weary after the pleasures of love[1]. The sight of a river issuing from a mountain suggests to the poet the idea of a woman slipping off from the lap of her lover[2]. When the current of a river is checked by fallen trees, the poet thinks of an angry maiden kept off from her determined course

---

1. मीनोपसंदर्शितमेखलानां
नदीवधूनां गतयोऽद्य मन्दाः।
कान्तोपभुक्तालसगामिनीनां
प्रभातकालेष्विव कामिनीनाम्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 30.54.

2. ददर्श च नगात्तस्मान्नदीं निपतितां कपिः।
अङ्कादिव समुत्पत्य प्रियस्य पतितां प्रियाम्।। *Ibid.*, V. 14.28.

by the friends of her lover[1]. In autumn, the rivers lose some of that abundance of water brought to them by the rains and the sand begins to show itself here and there. The poet says it is like shy women exposing their hips hesitatingly in their first unions with their lovers[2]. While describing the sleeping wives of Rāvaṇa it occurs to the poet that some of them are like rivers, with their hips corresponding to sandbanks[3]. In all these images, the water in a river seems to correspond to the flowing clothes of a woman. How these and similar images persist in later periods and what modifications they undergo is an altogether separate study, which the present writer has undertaken and the results of which he hopes someday to submit to the judgment of scholars. It will not, however, be out of place just to refer here to one or two verses of Kālidāsa, where the identification of river and a woman occurs. To him also, lives of fish in a river can represent the girdle going round the waist of a woman[4] and the sandbanks stand for her hips[5]. Speaking of Umā, he says that she, being smeared with white *agaru* and decorated with designs made of *gorocanā* surpassed the beauty of Gangā, with its sandbanks adorned with '*Cakravāka*' birds. And so on. It is not merely rivers which suggest to the poet the idea of a woman. Other collections of water can do the same. Ponds in autumn, we are told, with lines of swans for girdle, and lotuses

---

1. जलेन पतिताग्रैश्च पादपैरुपशोभितम् ।
वार्यमाणामिव क्रुद्धां प्रमदां प्रियबन्धुभिः ।। *Ibid.*, V. 14.30.

2. दर्शयन्ति शरन्नद्यः पुलिनानि शनैः शनैः ।
नवसंगमसव्रीडा जघनानीव योषितः ।। *Ibid.*, IV. 30.58.

3. आपगा इव ता रेजुर्जघनैः पुलिनैरिव । *Ibid.*, V. 9.51.

4. रवे व्यगाहत तरङ्गिणीमुमा
मीनपङ्क्तिपुनरुक्तमेखला । *Kumārasambhava*, VIII. 26.

5. चञ्चन्मनोज्ञशफरीरशनाकलापाः
पर्यन्तसंस्थितसिताण्डजपङ्क्तिहाराः ।
नद्यो विशालपुलिनान्तनितम्बबिम्बाः
मन्दं प्रयान्ति समदाः प्रमदा इवाद्य ।। *Ṛtu-saṃhāra*, III. 3.

for garland, have the supreme beauty of ornamented woman[1]. Nor is the comparison with a woman confined to collections of water, among all the objects of nature. In one place, we are told, that when the Sun moves on the South, the North, being deprived of it, is like a woman without her mark on her forehead[2]. In another place, it is suggested that the evening reddened by the setting Sun and having its stars brightened by the rays of the moon, is like a woman in love whose eyes open wide through the joy of being touched by the lover[3]. In a third place, it is the night with full moon for face, the bright stars for eyes and the white moonlight for garment which suggests comparison with a woman clad all in white[4].

If there is a special connection between a river and a woman in nature descriptions, it is the association of a male and a female elephant which seems to typify all romantic associations. Rāvaṇa surrounded by his wives looked like a male elephant surrounded by female ones in a forest[5]. On hearing Daśaratha's death, his wives screamed like female elephants in a forest when the leader of the herd has gone astray[6]. Sitā separated

---

1. प्रकीर्णहंसाकुलमेखलानां
प्रबुद्धपद्मोत्पलमालिनीनाम्।
वाप्युत्तमानामधिकाद्य लक्ष्मी–
र्वराङ्गनानामिव भूषितानाम्।। *Rāmā*, IV. 30.49.

2. सेवमाने दृढं सूर्ये दिशमन्तकसेविताम्।
विहीनतिलकेव स्त्री नोत्तरा दिक् प्रकाशते।। *Ibid.*, III. 16.8.

3. चञ्चच्चन्द्रकरस्पर्शहर्षोन्मीलिततारका।
अहो रागवती सन्ध्या जहातु स्वयमम्बरम्।। *Ibid.*, IV. 30.45.

4. रात्रिः शशाङ्कोदितचारुवक्त्रा
तारागणोन्मीलितचारुनेत्रा।। *Ibid.*, V. 30.45.
ज्योत्स्नांशुकप्रावरणा विभाति
नारीव शुक्लांशुकसंवृताङ्गी।। *Ibid.*, IV. 30.46.

5. स राक्षसेन्द्रः शुशुभे ताभिः परिवृतः स्वयम्।
करेणुभिर्यथारण्ये परिकीर्णो यथा द्विपः।। *Ibid.*, V. 11.12.

6. ततः प्रचुक्रुशुर्दीनाः सस्वरं ता वराङ्गनाः
करेणव इवारण्ये स्थानप्रच्युतयूथपाः।। *Ibid.*, II. 65.21.

from Rāma was like a female elephant separated from the mate[1]. This idea persists throughout the history of Sanskrit literature. It is not a mere accident that, in the 3rd act of the *Uttararāmacarita*, Bhavabhūti introduces the incident of a young elephant being attached by a mroe grown up one, while enjoying the company of its mate[2]. Steeped as he was in the atmosphere of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and wishing to convey to the reader the intensity of Rāma's feelings during his separation from Sītā he could not have thought of a better example than the separation of a happily united couple of elephants. It is this same psychology, in which the union of elephant couples, typifies all romantic unions, which makes Rāvaṇa tell the Rākṣasis :- "Bring Sītā round to my way of thinking, as one tames a young wild female elephant[3]." Sometimes, however, it is he cow and the bull which stand as a symbol of romantic union. This idea is present when the poet says that when Bharata entered Ayodhyā , the city looked like a cow deserted by the bull[4], or that Tārā mourned fallen Vālin as a cow mourns the bull killed by the lion[5], or that Rāvaṇa amidst his wives was like a bull among cows[6]. It must also be mentioned that the separation of the Cakravāka from its mate at night, destined to symbolize all separation of lovers in later Sanskrit literature, is already made use of in a few images in the *Rāmāyaṇa*[7].

---

1. गृहीतां लाडितां स्तम्भे यूथपेन विनाकृताम्।
   निश्वसन्तीं सुदुःखार्तां गजराजवधूमिव।।
2. सीतादेव्या स्वकरकलितैः शल्लकीपल्लवाग्रै–
   रग्रे लोलः करिकलभको यः पुरा पोषितोऽभूत्।
   वध्वा सार्धे पयसि विहरन् सोऽयमन्येन दपी–
   दुद्दामेन द्विरदपतिना सन्निपत्याभियुक्तः।। *Uttarramacarita,* III.6.
3. आनयध्वं वशं सर्वा वन्यां गजवधूमिव। *Rama.,* III. 56.31.
4. गोवृषेण परित्यक्तां गवां पत्नीमिवोत्सुकाम्। *Ibid.,* II. 114.9.
5. अहं पुत्रसहाया त्वामुपासे गतचेतनम्।
   सिंहेन पतितं सद्यः गौः सवत्सेव गोवृषम्।। *Ibid.,* IV. 23.26.
6. गवां मध्ये यथा वृषः। *Ibid.,* V. 11-11.
7. सहचररहितेव चक्रवाकी
   जनकसुता कृपणां दशां प्रपन्ना। *Ibid.,* V. 16.30.

So much about union of lovers in general. But the *Rāmāyaṇa* is primarily a description of the love of Rāma and Sītā and many are the images used to bring out its deep, noble, enduring and eternal character. Sītā belongs to Rāma as knowledge belongs to a Brahmin who has cultivated his soul[1]. The union of the two is pre-ordained. One cannot think of the one without the other. Sītā cannot leave Rāma any more than the lustre of the Sun leaves Meru[2]. The union of the two was as beautiful as that of the Moon with Rohiṇī[3] or Citrā[4], or of Viṣṇu with Lakṣmī[5]. It is just in this connection, while Sītā's devotion to Rāma is being described that one finds an allusion to old characters, legendary or historical, which is otherwise so rare a feature in the *Rāmāyaṇa.* While indignantly rejecting the request of the Rākṣasis to yield to Rāvaṇa, Sītā declares she is as devoted to Rāma as Śacī to Indra, as Arundhatī to Vasiṣṭha, as Rohiṇī to śaśin, as Lopāmudrā to Agastya, as Sukanyā to Cyavana, as Sāvitrī to Satyavān, as Śrīmatī to Kapila, as Madayantī to Sudāsa, as Keśinī to Sagara and as Damayantī to Naiṣadha[6]. More picturesque perhaps as an image is the statement that the wives of Rāvaṇa followed him as flashes of

1. अहमौपयिकी भार्या तस्यैव च धरापतेः।
   व्रतस्नातस्य विद्येव विप्रस्य विदितात्मनः।। *Ibid.,* V. 21.17.
2. न जहाति रता धर्मे मेरुमर्कप्रभा यथा। *Ibid.,* II. 40.24.
3. तया सुचरितं देव्या पुरा नूनं महत्तपः।
   रोहिणीव शशाङ्केन रामसंयोगमाप या।। *Ibid.,* II. 16.42.
4. उपेतं सीतया भूयश्चित्रया शशिनं यथा। *Ibid.,* II. 16.10.
   विरराज महाबाहुश्चित्रया चन्द्रमा यथा। *Ibid.,* III. 17.4.
5. अतीव रामः शुशुभे मुदान्वितो
   विभुः श्रिया विष्णुरिवामरेश्वरः। *Ibid.,* I. 77.29.
6. यथा शची महाभागा शक्रं समुपतिष्ठति।
   अरुन्धती वसिष्ठं च रोहिणी शशिनं यथा।
   लोपामुद्रा यथागस्त्यं सुकन्या च्यवनं यथा।।
   सावित्री सत्यवन्तं च कपिलं श्रीमती यथा।
   सौदासं मदयन्तीव केशिनी सगरं यथा।।
   नैषधं दमयन्तीव भैमी पतिमनुव्रता।। *Ibid.,* V. 24.9 and 2.

lightning follow the cloud[1]. The association of lightining and cloud has always typified the union of man and woman; a *fortiori*, that of Rāvaṇa, the huge dark, shapeless monster with his slim and graceful wife (cf. Mandodarī). Quite full of colour is the declaration of Rāvaṇa that Sītā has ravished his heart as the Garuḍa takes away his snake[2]. He is weary with love as a horse after a long journey[3]. Rāvaṇa's ignoble love for Sītā has stirred Vālmīki's imagination as few things have done and the result is a bunch of racy images. No two men can be more unlike each other than Rāma and Rāvaṇa. When the latter makes his ignoble proposal to Sītā, she rejects it saying that the difference between Rāma and him was the same as between gold and lead[4], sandal water and mud[5], the ocean and a petty rivulet[6], the elephant and a cat[7], the Garuḍa and the crow[8], the swan and the vulture[9]. Hence Rāvaṇa's desire for Sītā, Rāma's wife, is as contemptible and as impossible of realisation as that of a jackal for a lioness[10]. He might as well drink *'Kālakūṭa'* poison and hope to remain healthy.[11] It is as dangerous as licking the blade of a razor[12], or walking on spikes[13] with metal points. It is as much beyond his power as trying

---

1. अनुजग्मु: पतिं वीरं घनं विद्युल्लता इव। *Ibid.*, V. 18.15.
2. मनो हरसि मे भीरु सुपर्ण: पन्नगं यथा। *Ibid.*, V. 20.29.
3. श्रान्तोऽहं सततं कामाद्यातो हय इवाध्वनि। *Ibid.*, VI. 12.20.
4. यदन्तरं काञ्चनसीसलोहयो:। *Ibid.*, III. 47.46.
5. यदन्तरं चन्दनवारिपङ्कयो:। *Ibid.*, III. 47.46.
6. यदन्तरं स्यन्दनिकासमुद्रयो:। *Ibid.*, III. 47.45
7. यदन्तरं हस्तिबिडालयोर्वने। *Ibid.*, III. 47.46
8. यदन्तरं वायसवैनतेययो:। *Ibid.*, III. 47.47
9. यदन्तरं हंसकगृध्रयोर्वने। *Ibid.*, III. 47.47
10. त्वं पुनर्जम्बुक: सिंहीं मामिहेच्छसि दुर्लभाम्। *Ibid.*, III. 47.37
11. कालकूटविषं पीत्वा स्वस्तिमान् गन्तुमिच्छसि। *Ibid.*, III. 47.40
12. जिह्वया लेढि च क्षुरम्। *Ibid.*, III. 47.41
13. अयोमुखानां शूलानां मध्ये चरितुमिच्छसि। *Ibid.*, III. 47.44

to cross the ocean with a stone hanging round his neck[1], or deprive the Sun of its lustre[2], or take both the sun and the moon together in his hands[3]. For Rāvaṇa to touch Sītā is as outrageous as for a Cāṇḍāla to touch the altar in the middle of a sacrifice[4]. In taking Sītā away, Rāvaṇa does not realise that the knot of death is round his neck[5]. He is really tying on a snake to his clothes and does not know it[6]. Rāvaṇa wanting Sītā is trying to lift the Mandara mountain[7]. Sītā cannot respond to Rāvaṇa's love any more than twice-born can impart the Vedic *Mantra-s* to one who is not a twice-born[8]. Sītā, the true wife of Rāma, is as worthy of protection from the attacks of the wicked as the Veda from arguments full of logic[9]. Sugrīva promises Rāma to bring Sītā back as one brings back a lost Veda[10]. And so on.

So much for love of the Romantic type. Coming now to parental and filial love, it would surprise no one to hear that it is symbolised in the *Rāmāyaṇa* by the love of the cow for the calf. Kausalyā declares that she would follow Rāma to the forest as a cow follows its calf[11]. Rāma says his heart melts

---

1. अवसज्ज्य शिलां कण्ठे समुद्रं तर्तुमिच्छसि। *Ibid.*, III. 47.42.
2. इच्छसि प्रसभं हर्तुं प्रभामिव विवस्वतः। *Ibid.*, III. 37.14.
3. सूर्यचन्द्रमसौ चोभौ पाणिभ्यां हर्तुमिच्छसि। *Ibid.*, III. 47.43.
4. न शक्यां यज्ञमध्यस्था वेदिः स्रग्भाण्डमण्डिता।
   द्विजातिमन्त्रसंपूता चण्डालेनायमर्दितुम्।। *Ibid.*, III. 56.18.
5. ग्रीवायां प्रतिमुक्तं च कालपाशं न पश्यसि। *Ibid.*, III. 50.17.
6. सर्पमाशीविषं बद्ध्वा वस्त्रान्ते नावबुध्यसे। *Ibid.*, III. 50.17.
7. मन्दरं पर्वतश्रेष्ठं पाणिना हर्तुमिच्छसि। *Ibid.*, III. 47.40.
8. भावं न चास्याहमनुप्रदातु–
   मलं द्विजो मन्त्रमिवाद्विजाय। *Ibid.*, V. 28.
9. न शक्तस्त्वं बलाद्धर्तुं वैदेहीं मम पश्यतः।
   हेतुभिर्न्यायसंयुक्तैर्ध्रुवां वेदश्रुतीमिव। *Ibid.*, III. 50.22.
10. अहं तामानयिष्यामि नष्टां वेदश्रुतीमिव। *Ibid.*, IV. 6.5.
11. कथं हि धेनुः स्वं वत्सं गच्छन्तमनुगच्छति।
    अहं त्वानुगमिष्यामि यत्र वत्स गमिष्यसि।। *Ibid.*, II. 24.9.

on seeing the jewel sent to him by Sītā as a cow melts on seeing the calf[1]. Sometimes it is the mare and the colt which stand for parental love. Kausalyā runs to Rāma as a mare runs to a colt[2]. At one place, it is stated that Sumitrā without Lakṣmaṇa was like a branch of Karṇikāra without flowers, the idea being, of course, that chief ornament of a mother was her son[3]. Equally picturesque is the statement thar Rāma was Daśaratha's life walking abroad[4]. Usually, however, this image is used of brothers devoted to each other. Thus it is stated many times that Lakṣmaṇa is Rāma's life walking abroad[5]. Sometimes he is to be Rāma's right hand. The two Aśvins are, however, the symbol of brotherly affection[6]. Lakṣmaṇa and Rāma, Vālin and Sugrīva were devoted to each other like the two Aśvins[7]. Two brothers like Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, lending strength to each other, are like fire and wind[8].

Some images relating to friendship are rather noteworthy. Most of them dwell, however, on the negative aspect of it i.e., when it is not properly appreciated[9]. Friendship shown toward the ignoble, we are told, is like water flowing on lotus leaves. Neither makes any impression on the recepient. Or, it is like clouds soaring in autumn. It produces nothing. If indulged in, it ends badly, like an elephant bathing first and then covering

---

1. यथैव धेनुः स्रवति स्नेहाद्वत्सस्य वत्सला।
   तथा ममापि हृदयं मणिश्रेष्ठस्य दर्शनात्।। *Ibid.*, V. 66.3.
2. अभिचक्राम संहृष्टा किशोरं वडवा यथा। *Ibid.*, II. 20.20.
3. कर्णिकारस्य शाखेव शीर्णपुष्पा वनान्तरे। *Ibid.*, II. 92.23.
4. बहिश्च इव प्राणो बभूव गुणतः प्रियः। *Ibid.*, II. 1.19.
5. रामस्य दक्षिणो बाहुर्नित्यं प्राणो बहिश्चरः। *Ibid.*, III. 34.14.
6. अश्विनोरिव सौभ्रात्रं तयोर्लोकेषु विश्रुतम्। *Ibid.*, II. 8.31.
7. अन्योन्यसदृशौ वीरावुभौ देवाविवाश्विनौ। *Ibid.*, IV. 2.19.
8. स तेन सह संयुक्तः पावकेनानिलो यथा। *Ibid.*, III. 31.17.
9. यथा पुष्करपत्रेषु पतितास्तोयबिन्दवः।
   न श्लेषमभिगच्छन्ति तथानार्येषु सौहृदम्।। *Ibid.*, VI. 16.12.

itself with mud[1]. It is as useless as a bee drinking the *Kāśapuspa* and finding no honey in it[2]. To live with one who pretends to be a friend, but who is really not so, is taking a very great risk. Better to live with one's enemy or with an angry snake rather than with such a person[3]. Kaikeyī appeared to the poet to be such a person in her behaviour towards Daśaratha. In marrying her and living with her, Daśaratha did not know that he was touching a black snake in the dark[4]. He failed to realise that he was really embracing fire[5]. In his agony he exclaims that he had brought about his own destruction by keeping a serpent in his lap for too long[6]. He had been cheated by a woman hiding her real nature, as by fire covered with ashes[7]. It is interesting to note that this very image is used by the poet on another occasion to describe hidden talent or splendour. Sugrīva says that Rāma's ability and talent are not quite conspicuous. They are like fire covered with ashes[8]. One who pretends to be a friend, but who is really not one, is like a serpent, crying like a frog to attract and catch it[9]. It will be seen that the poet's views about friendship are, on the whole, rather pessimistic.

---

1. यथा पूर्वे गजः स्नात्वा गृह्य हस्तेन वै रजः।
   दूषयत्यात्मनो देहं तथानार्येषु सौहृदम्।। *Ibid.*, VI. 16.15.
2. यथा मधुकरस्तर्षात् काशपुष्पं पिबन्नपि।
   रसमत्र न विन्देत तथानार्येषु सौहृदम्।। *Ibid.*, VI. 16.14.
3. वसेत् सह सपत्नेन क्रुद्धेनाशीविषेण च।
   न तु मित्रप्रवादेन संवसेच्छत्रुसेविना।। *Ibid.*, VI. 16.2.
4. बालो रहसि हस्तेन कृष्णसर्पमिवास्पृशम्। *Ibid.*, II. 12.81.
5. अङ्गारमुपगूह्य स्म पिता में नावबुद्धवान्। *Ibid.*, II. 73.4.
6. चिरं बताङ्केन धृतासि सर्पी
   महाविषा तेन हतोऽस्मि मोहात्। *Ibid.*, II. 12.105.
7. छन्नया चलितस्त्वस्मि स्त्रिया भस्माग्निकल्पया। *Ibid.*, II. 34.46.
8. कामं राघव ते वाणी प्रमाणं धैर्यमाकृतिः।
   सूचयन्ति परं तेजो भस्मच्छन्नमिवानलम् *Ibid.*, IV. 11.81.
9. न त्वां रामो विजानीते सर्पे मण्डूकराविणम्। *Ibid.*, IV. 34.15.

When, we come to the relation between a king and his subjects, the picture is not so one-sided. There are many images illustrative of the love and devotion existing between good kings and their subjects. People watch Rāma go to see his father and they now await his return as the ocean awaits the rise of the moon[1]. Bharata tells Rāma who was unwilling to return to Ayodhyā that people await his return as the cultivators wait for rain[2]. Subjects are distressed by Rāma's departure as water animals by the drying-up of water in summer[3]. A good king is like the very eye of his subjects[4]. Even more picturesque are the images used to describe bad kings. Subjects despice a greedy king as they do the fire at the crematorium[5]. People ruled by a bad king are as pitiable as deer protected by a jackal[6]. Subjects avoid a foolish king as elephants avoid mud at the river ? We have thus briefly passed in a review the contents of the Imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Such a survey, would, however, not be complete if we did not say a few words about the forms in which the contents are couched and examine the relation between them. That is what we propose to do in our next and concluding section.

It is a remarkable fact that in spite of the antiquity and the age long reputation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as a *'Kāvya'*, writers on *Alaṅkāraśāstra* have not turned to if for preference for their illustrations. Not that references to the *Rāmāyaṇa* are totally absent

---

1. प्रतीक्षसे तस्य पुनः स्म निर्गमं
   यथोदयं चन्द्रमसः सरित्पतिः । *Ibid.*, II. 12.22.
2. त्वामेव हि प्रतीक्षन्ते पर्जन्यमिव कर्षकाः । *Ibid.*, II. 112.12.
3. तस्मात्तस्योपघातेन प्रजाः परमपीडिताः ।
   औदकानीव सत्वानि ग्रीष्मे सलिलसंक्षयात् ।। *Ibid.*, II. 33.13.
4. यथा दृष्टिः शरीरस्य नित्यमेव प्रवर्तते ।
   तथा नरेन्द्रो रामस्य प्रभवः सत्यधर्मयोः ।। *Ibid.*, II. 67.33.
5. लुब्धं न बहु मन्यन्ते श्मशानग्निमिव प्रजाः । *Ibid.*, III. 33.3.
6. रक्ष्यमाणा न वर्धन्ते मृगा गोमायुना यथा । *Ibid.*, IV. 17.42.
7. वर्जयन्ति नरा दूरं नदीपङ्कमिव द्विजाः । *Ibid.*, III. 33.5.

in works on *Alankārasāstra*. The work is frequently mentioned, together with the *Mahābhārata* as a source from which a poet might borrow his subject matter. The history of Sanskrit literature also shows to what extent it has been so used by poets right up to modern times. It is, however, true to say in a general manner that the *Rāmāyaṇa* plays a comparatively small part in the thousands of *śloka-s* which are given as illustrations of the different theories of poetics in the *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. Whether it be the *Alankāra* or the *Rīti* or the *Dhvani* or the *Vakrokti* system, it is from the later classical literature, from the works of authors like Kālidāsa, Bhāravi and Māgha that critics primarily draw their examples, and not from the *'Ādikāvya'*.

It is not that *Rāmāyaṇa* cannot furnish illustrations of the *Alaṅkāra-s*. The best proof of it is that the commentators do occasionally point out different *Alaṅkāra-s* in the verses of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. But they only point the well-known ones and do not say anything which has a historical value.

The most recent study of the form of the *Alaṅkāra-s* from the historical point of view is found in Mr. Diwekar's *"Les fleurs de rhetorique dans l' Inde"* p. 35-53 (Paris, 1930). The author draws attention to those ornamental devices for which the poet seems to have a preference and those which he holds to be the poet's own invention. Among the former, he mentions the repetition of syllables which from part of different words : वानराणां नराणां च पुरस्यान्तःपुरस्य च; the repetition of similar sounds in a verse or in a stanza : परिकुपितं पितरं पाति पातीतः; the use of rhyme consisting in the repetition of the same word at a definite place in the verse, the use of *Arthālaṅkāra-s* like *Upamā, Rūpaka,* etc. The author is of opinion that we can see in the *Rāmāyaṇa* the development of the *Alaṅkāra-s*, *Upameyopamā* and *Ananvaya*. Among the devices which he considers Vālmīki's own invention, Mr. Diwekar mentions the combinations of *Śabdālaṅkāra-s* and *Arthālaṅkāra-s*, the particular kind of rhyme called *Śṛṅkhalāyamaka* :

Rāvaṇam bhaja bhartāram bhartaram sarvarakṣasām. And even the use of such expressions as (1) the repetition of the word 'क' in order to indicate difference between two things (2) नैतच्चित्रम्.

It must be said in regard to the above that it is possible to establish preference by mere counting, whereas one feels a certain diffidence when it comes to attributing to the poet the invention of particular devices. Form is something which is meant to be the same in all writers. A good deal of the work of commentators consists in pointing out the same forms in the *Alaṅkāra-s* of the different writers. Poetic theory also assumes that the form of imagery is the same in the case of all writers. Indeed, poets are expected to conform themselves to the definition of the forms given in the *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. If one analyses the *Alaṅkāra-s* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* one is likely to come across practically all the *Alaṅkāras* which have been defined and analysed in the *Śāstra*. Some may, of course, be found more frequently used than others, but that is due to the inherent nature of the *Alaṅkāra-s* themselves. In these circumstances, to say about a particular *Alaṅkāra* that it is the invention of Vālmīki requires a good knowlegde of contemporary and antecedent literature. The most that one can perhaps say is that the *Rāmāyaṇa* is the earliest known work in which a particular *Alaṅkāra* occurs and I take it that this is what Mr. Diwekar means when he calls a particular *Alaṅkāra* an invention of Vālmīki.

Things are slightly different when it comes to the contents of an *Alaṅkāra*. Here it is that even poetic theory and ancient tradition expect a poet to show his originality and power of invention. Also, the contents of an *Alaṅkāra* can, in some cases, come only out of individual minds, specially gifted minds. When Kālidāsa says : मणौ वज्रसमुत्कीर्णे सूत्रस्येवास्ति मे गतिः, one feels that not everybody could think of such a comparison.

It does not require a genius to invent the particular form of *Alaṅkāra* called *Upamā* Perhaps it would be difficult for most of us to speak for half an hour continuously without introducing *Upamā* into our speech. Such *Upamā* would perhaps not be poetic, but to say of an Upamā that it is poetic or not is to make a distinction in contents and not in form.

When one feels diffidence in attributing a particular form of *Alaṅkāra* to the inventive power of Vālmīki, what to say of such expressions as the repetition of क, and the use of नैतच्चित्रम् ? I feel that these have always been part of the everyday speech of the people and do not depend upon a genius for their existence.

As was said before Mr. Diwekar's study in an attempt to determine the part which the *Rāmāyaṇa* has played in the evolution of the forms of Sanskrit imagery. The series of sections of which this is the last, has been a study of the contents of the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. In the previous sections, an attempt was made to determine the particular occasions on which images appear in abundance and the particular objects which are brought in to describe particular things. In the present section, I wish to do no more than make a few observations on the relation between content and form in the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

It is not always possible to establish a relation of cause and effect between form and image. One can, however, establish certain associations, certain contents which always appear together with certain forms.

Mr. Diwekar has already pointed out the occurrence of continued metaphors in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (p. 48). He has, however, said nothing about their contents. To me, they seem worthy of observation. A continued metaphor is a comparison involving complete identification between two things and their parts. The standard of comparison must, therefore, be something complex,

something having parts. Certain complex things have, therefore, become fixed in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and, as will be shown, persist in the later literature also.

It is but natural that the immense ocean, with its ever surging waves and the inexhaustible life within it, should occur to the poet when anything complex had to be described. Thus the grief of Daśaratha at the departure of Rāma to the forest is compared to the ocean. Once the identification between the ocean and grief was made, it had to be followed up, to be justified so to speak and the result is that we get a series of identifications of the parts of both. Daśaratha declares to Kausalyā that it is impossible for him to cross the ocean of grief. This ocean has sighs for waves and whirlpools; it is muddy with the current of tears; its fishes are the throwing about of arms in despair; its roar is weeping; its weeds are dishevelled hair; its mare *(Vadvā)* is Kaikeyī; it is the result of Daśaratha's tears; the words of the Kubjā (Mantharā) are its crocodiles and its coasts are extensive, as it would last as long or Rāma is banished.[1] The simple identification of grief and ocean is common enough. Even the English expression "plunged in grief" is a reminder that grief can be thought of a collection of water. What is noteworthy in the above example is the attempt to push the identification to its logical conclusion, even at the risk of seeming artificial. The ocean appears again and again in such complex metaphors. Thus, Śūrpaṇakhā aska Rāvaṇa "Why do you not protect me when I am plunged in the ocean of grief, inhabited by crocodiles in the form of chagrin and waves in the form

---

1. श्वसितोर्मिमहावर्तो बाष्पवेगजलाविलः ।
बाहुविक्षेपमीनोऽसौ विक्रन्दितमहास्वनः ।।
प्रकीर्णकेशशैवालः कैकेयीवडवामुखः ।
ममाश्रुवेगप्रभवः कुब्जावाक्यमहाग्रहः ।।
वरवेलो नृशंसाया रामप्रव्राजनायतः ।
यस्मिन् बत निमग्नोऽहं कौसल्ये राघवं विना ।। *Rāmā*, II. 59. 28-31.

of trembling" ?[1] On another occasion, it is the sky which is identified with the ocean. We are told that Hanumān flew across the sky which was a veritable ocean. The moon in the sky corresponds to the lotus; the sun to Kāraṇdava; the stars Tiṣya and Śravaṇa to Kadamba birds; clouds to weeds; the star Punarvasu to big fish; Lohitānga to crocodiles and Airāvata to big islands.[2] The sky, like the ocean, strikes one by its complexity and it is, therefore, perfectly intelligible that the two are identified as wholes as well as in their parts. An equally intelligible identification is that of the army of the gods with the ocean. In this identification, the weapons Śakti and Tomara are the fishes, scattered arms are the weeds, horses are frogs, elephants are turtles, Rudra and Āditya are the big crocodiles; the Maruts and the Vasus are the snakes; chariots, horses and elephants are its water currents and infantry, the sandy shores[3]. The above examples are sufficient to prove the frequency with which the ocean appears in continued metaphors in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Nor is it confined to the *Rāmāyaṇa*. It occurs in the later literature also. For instance, Aśvaghoṣa says in his '*Saundarānanda*' that the Buddha crossed the ocean of evils in which *Upādhi* was the water, *Ādhi*, the

---

1. विषादनक्राध्युषिते परित्रासोर्मिमालिनि।
   किं मां न त्रायसे मग्नां विपुले शोकसागरे।। *Ibid*., III. 21-22.

2. सचन्द्रकुमुदं रम्यं सार्ककारण्डवं शुभम्।
   तिष्यश्रवणकादम्बमभ्रशैवालशाद्वलम्।।
   पुनर्वसुमहामीनं लोहितागमहाग्रहम्।
   ऐरावतमहाद्वीपं स्वातीहंसविलासितम्।।
   वातसङ्घातजालोर्मि चन्द्रांशुशिशिरांशुमत्।
   हनुमानपरिश्रान्तः पुप्लुव गगनार्णवम्।। *Ibid*., V. 57. 2-4.

3. शक्तितोमरमीनं च विनिकीर्णास्त्रशैवलम्।
   गजकच्छपसम्बाधमश्वमण्डूकसंकुलम्।।
   रुद्रादित्यमहाग्राहं मरुद्वसुमहोरगम्।
   रथाश्वगजतोयौधं पदातिपुलिनं महत्।।
   अनेन हि समासाद्य देवानां बलसागरम्।। *Ibid*., VI. 7.20.

water-animals, anger, intoxication and fear, the waves.[1] Again, he says in his *'Buddhacarita'* that the Buddha will make the world cross the ocean of sorrow by means of the boat of knowledge. In this ocean, the diseases are the foam, oldage the waves, and death the current.[2]

Sometimes it is the river which takes the place of the ocean. We are told that the battle ground is like a river. The dead heroes are the banks; broken arms, the great trees; streams of blood, the water; death, the ocean to which it leads; liver and spleen, the mud; scattered entrails, the weeds; broken limbs and heads, the fish; the vultures, swans; the herons, the *Sārasa* birds and human fat, the foam.[3] Following Vālmiki, Aśvaghoṣa says in his *Buddhacarita* that the thirsty world will drink from the river of *Dharma*, having the current of wisdom, banks in the form of firm conduct, cool through *Samādhi* and having *Cakravāka-s* in the form of vows.[4]

It is not only collections of water like the ocean and

---

1. स हि दोषसागरमगाधमुपाधिजलमाधिजन्तुकम्।
क्रोधमदभयतरङ्गचलं प्रततार लोकमपि चाप्यतारयत्।। *Saun.* III. 14

2. दुःखार्णवादप्याधिविकीर्णफेनाज्जरातरङ्गान्मरणोग्रवेगात्।
उत्तारयिष्यत्ययमुह्यमानमार्तं जगज्ज्ञानमहाप्लवेन।। *Buddhacarita.*, 1. 75

3. हतवीरौघवप्रां तु भग्नायुधमहाद्रुमाम्।
शोणितौघमहातोयां यमसागरगामिनीम्।।
यकृत्प्लीहमहापङ्कां विनिकीर्णान्त्रशैवलाम्।
भिन्नकायशिरोमीनामङ्गावयवशाद्वलाम्।।
गृध्रहंसवराकीर्णां कङ्कसारससेविताम्।
मेदःफेनसमाकीर्णामावर्तस्वननिःस्वनाम्।
तां कापुरुषदुस्तारां युद्धभूमिमयीं नदीम्।
नदीमिव घनापाये हँससारससेविताम्।। *Rāma*, VI. 58. 29-32.

4. प्रज्ञाम्बुवेगां स्थिरशीलवप्रां
समाधिशीतां व्रतचक्रवाकाम्।
अस्योत्तमां धर्मनदीं प्रवृत्तां
तृष्णार्दितः पास्यति जीवलोकः।। *Buddhacarita.*, I. 76

the river which appear in continued metaphors. Sometimes, it is fire which takes their place. The simple metaphor 'fire of sorrow' is almost a common place in Sanskrit literature and there is, therefore, nothing surprising in its occurring in continued metaphors. Thus Kausalyā says that the fire of sorrow, fanned by the separation of Rāma, fed by the fuel of lamentation, having offerings in the form of weeping and smoke in the form of anxiety and tears etc., will consume her in the absence of Rāma.[1] As in the *Rāmāyaṇa,* so in later literature also, fire continued to appear in continued metaphors. Thus, in the *Buddacarita,* we are told that Rāhula, son of the Buddha, being burnt by the fire of sorrow, to which separation from the Buddha added fresh fuel, whose smoke was sighs and flame, despair, goes to see him outside and inside the palace.[2] In another passage, Rāma himself is compared to fire. In this state arrows are his sparks, and bow and dagger, his fuel.[3]

Another object which plays an important part in continued metaphors in the *Rāmāyaṇa* as well as in the later literature is the snake. Kumbhakarṇa asks Rāvaṇa : "O king ! who brought you the snake in the form of Sitā whose chest is its coils, anxiety concerning whom is its poison, whose smile is its fangs and

---

1. अयं तु मामात्मभवस्तवादर्शनमारुतः ।
विलापदुःखसमिधो रुदिताश्रुहुताहुतिः ।।
चिन्तावाष्पमहाधूमस्तवागमनचिन्तजः ।
कर्शयित्वाधिकं पुत्र निःश्वासायाससंभवः ।।
त्वया विहीनामिह मां शोकाग्निरतुलो महान् ।
प्रधक्ष्यति यथा कक्ष्यं चित्रभानुर्हिमात्यये ।। *Rāmā*, II. 24-6-7-8.

2. शोकाग्निना त्वद्विरहेन्धनेन
निःश्वासधूमेन तमःशिखेन ।
त्वद्दर्शनायच्र्छति दह्यमानः
सोऽन्तःपुरं चैव पुरं च कृत्स्नम् ।। *Buddhacarita.*, IX. 29

3. शरार्चिषमनाधृष्यं चापखड्गेन्धनं रणे ।
रामाग्नि सहसा दीप्तं न प्रवेष्टुं त्वमर्हसि ।। *Rāmā*, III. 37.15.

whose fine fingers are its fine heads ?"[1] Vālmīki seems to have a preference for the five-headed snake on such occasions. Lakṣmaṇa, in his anger, looked like a five-headed snake with arrows for tongue, its string for coils and his own lustre for poison.[2] Similarly in the *Saundarananda,* Nanda says to the Buddha : "I have been bitten in the heart by the snake in the form of love, having evil for hood, destruction for glance, blunder for fangs and ignorance for poison; give me, therefore, an antedote, O great physician ![3]

The army itself is a sufficiently complex thing to appear in such metaphors. The clouds, we are told, with banners in the shape of lightning and emitting a roar in the form of thunderbolt like an army of monkeys ready for batlle.[4]

The above examples do not exhaust the list of objects which appear in complex metaphors. In the beautiful description of the rainy season occurring in the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa*, we are told there is music in the forests. In this music, the buzzing of bees is the *Viṇā ;* time is marked by the cries of monkeys and

---

1. वृतो हि बाह्वन्तरभोगराशि–
श्चिन्ताविषः सस्मिततीक्ष्णदंष्ट्रः।
पञ्चाङ्गुलीपञ्चशिरोऽतिकायः।
सीतामहाहिस्तव केन राजन्।। *Ibid.*, VI. 14.2.

2. बाणशल्यस्फुरज्जिह्वः सायकासनभोगवान्।
स्वतेजोविषसंभूतः पञ्चास्य इव पन्नगः।। *Ibid.*, IV 31.30

3. अनर्थभोगेन विघातदृष्टिना
प्रमाददंष्ट्रेण तमोविषाग्निना।
अहं हि दष्टो हृदि मन्मथाग्निना
विधत्स्व तस्मादगदं महाभिषक्।। *Saundarā*, X. 55

4. तडित्पताकाभिरलंकृताना–
मुदीर्णगम्भीरमहांरवाणाम्।
विभान्ति रूपाणि बलाहकानां
रणोत्सुकानामिव वानराणाम्।। *Rāmā*,, IV. 28.31

the roar of clouds corresponds to the sound of Mṛdaṅga.[1] Music appears again in the indignant speech of Rāvaṇa when he hears that Rāma has come to Laṅkā to fight him. He says : "I shall descend on the stage of the battlefield and play my lute in the form of my bow, with the bow in the form of arrows."[2] In the description of the rainy season referred to above, the sky is identified with a lover. In this identification, gentle breeze forms the sigh, the reddish hue of sunset corresponds to sandal paste and the pale clouds to the pale face of the lover.[3] In an equally beautiful description of the autumn occurring also in the *Kiṣkindhākāṇda*, the night is identified with a woman. The moon is her face, the stars are the eyes, and the moonlight her clothes.[4] More prosaic is an identification of Rāma with a tree, the flowers and fruits being Sītā and the branches being Sugrīva, Jāmbavan, Kumuda and Nala.[5] More striking, perhaps, is the comparison between mountains and *Brahmacārins* : the clouds are the *Kṛṣṇājina*, being dark in colour; streams are the sacred thread, being bright and flowing; the caves being filled with air by the wind corresponds to the taking in of

---

1. षट्पादतन्त्रीमधुराभिधानं प्लवङ्गमोदीरितकण्ठतालम् ।
   आविष्कृतं मेघमृदङ्गनादैर्वनेषु संगीतमिव प्रवृत्तम् ।। *Ibid.*, IV. 28. 36.

2. मम चापमयीं वीणां शरकोणैः प्रवादिताम् ।
   ज्याशब्दतुमुलां घोरामार्तगीतमहास्वनाम् ।।
   नाराचतलसन्नादां नदीमहितवादिनाम् ।
   अवगाह्य महारङ्गं वादयिष्याम्यहं रणे ।। *Ibid.*, VI. 24. 42-43.

3. मन्दमारुतनिःश्वासं सन्ध्याचन्दनरञ्जितम् ।
   आपाण्डुजलदं भाति कामातुरमिवाम्बरम् ।। *Ibid.*, IV. 28. 6.

4. रात्रिः शशाङ्कोदितसौम्यवक्त्रा
   तारागणोन्मीलितचारुनेत्रा ।
   ज्योत्स्नांशुकप्रावरणा विभाति
   नारीव शुक्लांशुकसंवृताङ्गी ।। *Ibid.*, IV. 30. 46.

5. रामवृक्षं रणे हन्मि सीतापुष्पफलप्रदम् ।
   प्रशाखा यस्य सुग्रीवो जाम्बवान् कुमुदो नलः ।। *Ibid.*, VI. 100. 4.

breath or *Prāṇāyāma.*[1]

The above examples are sufficient to show the kind of object that figure in continued metaphors and the historical interest which they have in view of their persistence in later times. The association of form and contents which we find in the above example is the most striking of all in the *Rāmāyaṇa.*

Summing up the results of this study, we have found that imagery comes forth more spontaneously and in greater abundance in descriptions of nature and in speeches made by the different characters when they are under the stress of some emotion. The objects to which persons, or ideas, or situations are compared are chiefly drawn from nature. Though Vālmīki has incorporated into his work much popular imagery which was due to the inventive faculty of no particular writer, there is also in the imagery of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, much that could have been the creation of individual minds. The contents of Vālmīki's imagery persist to a very great extent in later works, whose works can, therefore, be better understood with reference to the *Rāmāyaṇa.* To determine the exact relation between Vālmīki and the later writers is a separate study.

❑ ❑ ❑

---

1. मेघकृष्णाजिनधरा धारायज्ञोपवीतिनः ।
मारुतापूरितगुहाः प्राधीता इव पर्वताः ।। *Ibid.*, IV. 28. 10.

Fundamentals of the Vedic Epistemology

Prof. S. P. Singh
Senior Fellow, ICPR, Delhi

The word *veda* has primarily been used in the verbal form in the context of knowing things of all varieties, that is, gross sensory, imperceptible, abstract as also supremely metaphysical. For instance, Varuṇa is said in the Ṛgveda to have knowledge of boats sailing on the sea, of birds flying in the air, of the twelve regular months along with that of the additional one.[1] All these obviously refer to things mundane but of several grades including sensory as well as intellectual. In the same continuation, the seer is appreciative of Varuṇa's knowledge of the circular movement of air in all its expansiveness and high altitude.[2] While knowledge of the boats sailing on high sea and of birds flying high in the sky is sensory, division of time in years of correct length as also understanding of the movement of air in a circular way is highly intellectual. And, on both these counts, the Vedic seer has to offer us accounts of amazing nature from that hoary past relating to which the rest of the world has left us hardly with fossils and mutilated structures of stone.

Needless to point out that it is the insights of the Vedic seers which have led to the development of the six systems of

---

1. वेदा यो वीनां पदमन्तरिक्षेण पतताम्। वेद नावः समुद्रियः।।
वेद मासो धृतव्रतो द्वादश प्रजावतः। वेदा य उपजायते।। *RV. I.25.7-8.*
2. वेद वातस्य वर्तनिमुरोर्ऋष्वस्य बृहतः।। *Ibid., I.25.9.*

philosophy, derivative system of linguistic analysis as developed by Yāska, format of grammar as worked out by Pāṇini, the astronomical system as developed by Lagadha and his followers, and the medicinal and surgical systems as evolved by Caraka and Suśruta. Apart from these, which may for the time being be set aside as things foundational in their respective areas, no matter howsoever promising otherwise, there are certain references in these texts which bespeak of ideas coinciding with latest discoveries in science. When the Yajurveda describes all objects in the universe as also the latter as a whole as in a state of flux, it obviously anticipates the relevant theories of modern physics at least in their latest formulations. According to the modern science the world on both its ends, that is the macroscopic and microscopic, stands in a state of constant flux. While on the macroscopic side planets and starts are constantly moving in their own circles and galaxies are running away from one another at staggering speeds reaching up to approximation of he velocity of light, on the microscopic side sub-atomic particles like electrons are taking round of their nucleus at almost the same velocity.

That Vedic statements like the above are not just incidental but are based on certain verifiable facts is evident from observations like one made by Viśvāmitra in regard to the movement of Indra. He describes Indra as moving between the heaven and the earth thrice in a period of forty-eight minutes as the word muhūrta indicates. Through this statement he seems to have anticipated the latest findings of modern science in regard to the velocity of light at three lakhs of kilometres per second as it too takes approximately eight minutes to reach the earth after travelling from the sun.[1] It is most probably on account of this insight of Viśvāmitra's that someone subsequently has come to formulate the velocity of the light of the sun almost at the same

---

1. रूपंरूपं मघवा बोभवीति मायाः कृण्वानस्तन्वं परि स्वाम्।
त्रिर्यद्दिवः परि मुहूर्तमागात् स्वैर्मन्त्रैरनृतुपा ऋतावा।। *Ibid. III.53.8.*

rate as recounted in the śloka happening to be quoted by Sāyaṇa in his commentary on Ṛgveda 1.50.4.[1]

Equally amazing is Viśvāmitra's coincidence with the modern scientist in envisaging Agni as the basic stuff of creation. In science the theory of big bang is a well-known and widely accepted proposition. In view of the flight of the galaxies from one another as also the involvement of common stuff in their making, it is supposed under this theory that they originated from a common source. That source could not but be a ball of fire extremely compressed and hot and lying in a state of spacelessness as also timelessness. As such, it is supposed to have exploded at a certain moment with a bang and to have led to the formation of galaxies and stars out of the stuff of the ball of fire. The space-time continuum, according to this theory, is also a consequence of the same explosion. Almost a kindred view of Agni has been presented by Viśvāmitra in a mantra where he visualises Agni with its lustre not only in the heaven, over and inside the earth, in vegetations and waters but also as the principal agent responsible for creation of the interstellar space.[2] This amazing coincidence apart, vision of the presence of Agni in vegetations and water in itself is astounding particularly in view of its antiquity.

Still more surprising probably are the findings of the seers on the microscopic side. To remind ourselves of the findings of modern science in this respect of the reality, the invisible atom is considered to be the buidling block of the universe not on account of its tangible volume, which in its last analysis is only next to nothingness but on account of the immensity of action of particles and antipartlces at work inside it and defying all

---

1. योजनानां सहस्रे द्वे द्वे शते द्वे च योजने।
एकेन निमेषार्धेन क्रममाण नमोऽस्तु।। *Sāyaṇa, Ṛgveda Bhāsya I.50.4.*

2. अग्ने यत् ते दिवि वर्चः पृथिव्यां यदोषधीष्वप्स्वा यजत्र।
येनान्तरिक्षमुर्वाततन्थ त्वेषः स भानुरर्णवो नृचक्षाः।। *Ibid, III.22.2.*

attempts at determination of their form with any precision and definiteness. Similar is the case with the Vedic seer in his conception of the primary agents of creation, namely the gods. Indra, for instance, is supposed on the one hand to have released the seven streaming planes of existence as also to have extricated the cows of wisdom out of ignorance as represented by the Panis and the Soma of equanimity out of the clutches of the demons of discordance, and, on the other to have become as tiny as a horse's hair when struck by his adversary.[1] The secret of this duality of form and function of the primary agent of creation gets unveiled in the well-known mantra seen by Garga Bhāradvāja in which Indra is said to have assumed all possible forms of the world by virtue of his inestimable dynamism just to see himself as reflected in them. Assumption of all forms by the formless has been characterised here as māyā, the inexplicable principle of creation.[2] This mantra obviously suggests how the basic principle of consciousness, as represented by Indra, has gone down to assume the form of matter and material and physical bodies as also of the being embodied in them through its creative dynamism so as to rediscover itself by passing through them.

This central idea gets clarified partly categorically and partly allegorically in the Upaniṣad through the postulation of Ātman, as the concentric principle of consciousness, turning itself into the universe as also into the human individual and entering into the latter through the saggital suture at the top of the head and moving between the brain and the heart and controlling all the functions of them through nerves as many as seventy two thousand and as fine as thousandth part of a hair, as elaborated upon by the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.[3]

---

1. अश्व्यो वारो अभवस्तदिन्द्र सृके यत् त्वा प्रत्यहन् देव एकः।
अजयो गा अजय शूर सोममवासृजः सर्तवे सप्तसिन्धून्।। *Ibid. I.32.12.*
2. रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव तदस्य रूपं प्रतिचक्षणाय ।
इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयते युक्ता ह्यस्य हरयः शता दश।। *Ibid, VI.47.18.*
3. *Ait. Up. I. 1-3.; Brh. Up. IV 2.2-3*

Leaving apart the idea of consciousness assuming the form of matter, which understandably is beyond the purview of science as yet and for the future of it to come up to the same, even the idea of a nerve as subtle as thousandth part of a hair spreading over the whole of the human body in such a staggering number and flowing in it a liquid of several colours, as the Upaniṣad tells us, in spite of all its possibility, has eluded modern scientists so far and yet on the other hand has been alluded to so precisely by the Vedic sage. These nerves indeed seem to serve as the bridge between the physical and the psychological and as such to have formed a pre-eminent basis of elevating the Indian system of medicine to the psychological and spiritual height.

It is in this capacity that the Ātman has been characterised in the Upaniṣad as sub-atomic on the one hand and macroscopic to the extent of infinitude on the other as also the final determinant of everything whatever.[1]

The numerical system of multiples of ten as in common use in the Veda is another instance of the paramount sagacity of the Vedic seer. But for this system, the world even at this stage might have been doing its counting somewhat as it is done in the Roman system allowing little scope for addition, subtraction, multiplication and division directly in numerical terms. As such, arithmetic itself would have been a non-starter, not to talk of mathematics with all its pre-eminent role in the development of science. It is indeed the Vedic numerical system which having travelled over to the West through the Arabs in the middle ages has to a very great extent made science what it is today with all its technological possibilities. The sagacity of the Vedic seer in this respect can be understood from the fact that while even up to the time of the famous traveller Alberuni the entire world, including the Arabs themselves, had not gone

1. अणोरणीयान् महतो महीयान्। *Karha Up. II.20*

beyond thousand in numeration, the Veda had crossed millennia in the past the figure ten thousand million practically with the further possibility of going to any number beyond it up to the infinity itself. This could obviously have not been possible without the discovery of the zero on the part of the seers. It is this capacity of staggering calculation developed by the seers which in course of time led to dating of the event of creation of the universe in the Vedic tradition at about 4.294 billion years which is immensely close to the modern scientific dating in sharp contrast to the traditional Western one at about 3000 B.C.

This understandably is just a tip of the colossal iceberg of knowledge lying submerged in the oceanic depth of the Vedic texts. Even this much, however, is, to my mind, sufficient to stimulate our curiosity to inquire into the way the seers might have taken to in their explorations. Of course, it is sad to note that our six systems of philosophy falling directly in the line of the Vedic thought have ended up with their responsibility in this regard by admitting the Veda as one of the sources of valid knowledge without raising to any significant extent the question as to how the Vedic knowledge came to be acquired so as to get the sense of eternal verity attached to it. Instead of going into the depth of the problem what they satisfied themselves with was the admittance of the divine origin of the Veda. What is divine, must be faultless, this was the argument advanced by them in favour of their acceptance of the Veda as a valid source of knowledge. Instead of going into the details of what the Veda itself has to say in this regard, they involved themselves in the controversies of eternity and non-eternity as also personal and impersonal origin of the words and wisdom of the Veda which obviously are insoluble in any final sense. It becomes, therefore, imperative now to reconstruct the Vedic methodology of knowledge strictly on the basis of the statements of the seers themselves in this regard.

That the seers did not disregard the senses and the sense-perception is borne out by many a passage to be found throughout the whole of the Veda. Gotama Rāhūgaṇa, for instance, prays to Viśve Devāh to enable him and others of his kind to listen to and see whatever is auspicious.[1] Similarly Gṛtsamada, in course of his prayer to Aśvins, entreats them to make available to him honey like his lips, give protection to him like his nostrils and listen to him like his ears themselves.[2] Evidently they treated the sense organs as protectors of life and feeders of mind in the same way as do the hands serve as protectors and the mother's breasts as feeders of the body.

Rising above the care of the body and the senses they paid due heed to mind also as coordinator of the functions of the senses. In this respect worth quoting is the observation of Āṅgirasa Bṛhaspati that there are people who, even though seeing, are incapable of seeing the Vāk and, even though listening to it, are incapable of listening to it in any meaningful way.[3] It amounts to suggest the inadequacy of the sensory perception in itself without due coordination of the mind. Further, coordination between the senses and the mind and verification of what is thus cognised by means of other sensory perceptions is indeed essential for valid knowledge, according to Dīrghatamas. This is evident from his observation that there are certain forces which really are females but have happened to be reported to him as males and he mistook them as such becuase, lacking in eyesight, he could not see them as really they were.[4] In this instance

---

1. भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयाम देवा भद्रं पश्येमाक्षभिर्यजत्राः। *RV. I.89.8*
2. ओष्ठाविव मध्वास्ने वदन्ता स्तनाविव पिप्यतं जीवसे नः।
   नासेव नस्तन्वो रक्षितारा कर्णाविव सुश्रुता भूतमस्मे।। *Ibid, III.39.6*
3. उत त्वः पश्यन् न ददर्श वाचमुत त्वः शृण्वन् न शृणोत्येनाम्।
   Ibid, X.71.4
4. स्त्रियः सतीस्ताँ उ मे पुंस आहुः पश्यदक्षण्वान् न वि चेतदन्धः।
   Ibid, I.164.16

as referred to by the seer, what he received from others through his ears could not be verified by means of seeing since he lacked in the power of the same and took it verbatim as it was reported to him. Had he had his eyesight intact, he could very well have detected the falsity of the statement. It shows that the senses, even though aptly coordinated by the mind, are liable to be proved wrong unless and until what they have perceived gets verified through a similar coordination of some other sense organ and the mind. This observation of the seer thus points to three significant factors in the acquistion of valid knowledge at the level concerned : (1) Necesity of checking the veracity of knowledge received through one sense organ by some other one; (2) Liability of the mind to get misled; and (3) Overall pre-eminence of visual perception in the acquisition of valid knowledge at the level of the senses and the sense-mind.

It is sufficient to suggest how positivistic the Vedic seer was in regard to knowledge and the mode of its acquisition. He gave due weight to senses, the sense-mind and their mutual coordination in the the process of acquiring valid knowledge. In this process, the accorded pre-eminence to visual perception over and above the verbal even. He is always inclined to see things by his own eyes prior to admitting his understanding of them as valid.

His seeing, however, is not confined to the sensory. The sensory is important in his scheme of cognition no doubt but only to a certain extent. Beyond its range it needs to be supplemented by reasoning. But the seer is well aware of the limitations of reason also, since it too is dependent to a great extent on things mudane and their perceptions by the senses and the sense-mind. Its inadequacy is understood by the seer particularly in relationship to things supramundane.

This can be elucidated by an experience of Bharadvaja, the seer of the sixth mandala of the Ṛgveda. As is evident from

the context, the seer is contemplating on the ultimate texture of the universe beyond what is visible. Being not contented with just the cloth of creation and its utility, he ventures to go deep into the problem of the whereabouts of the yarn used as the warp and the woof of it as also the weaver himself. Proceeding thus he happens to identify the weaver as also the ultimate source of the yarn in the form of Vaiśvānara, the universal and transcendent Person. Changing the simile of the cloth and the weaver he conceives of Him as the first Hotr priest of the sacrifice of the creation of the universe, and having visualised Him as expanded from His basic eternity to the space-time continuum in all its infinitude, he feels that not only his powers of hearing and seeing are failing him but also failing him are his mind and intellect with the consequence that no more is he in a position either to express himself or even to think.[1]

The reason behind the failure of the senses, mind and intellect of the seer on coming face to face with Vaiśvānara happens to be given in the Upaniṣads, particularly the Chāndogya and Bṛhadāraṇyaka in the form of the Vaiśvānara Vidyā and Antaryāmin Vidyā respectively. When the five learned men, namely, Prācinaśāla, Satyayajña, Indrayumna, Jana and Budila go along with sage Uddālaka to Aśvapati Kaikeya and request him to initiate them in the Vaiśvānara Vidyā, he after inquiring into the background of their sādhanā severally explains to them how Vaiśvānara is the Ātman with the heaven as its head, sun

1. नाहं तन्तु न वि जानाम्योतुं न यं वयन्ति समरेऽतमानाः।
कस्य स्वित्पुत्र इह वक्त्वानि परो वदात्यवरेण पित्रा।।
स इत् तन्तुं स वि जानान्योतुं स वक्त्वानि ऋतुथा वदाति।
य ईं चिकेतदमृतस्य गोपा अवश्चरन् परो अन्येन पश्यन्।।
अयं होता प्रथमः पश्यतेममिदं ज्योतिरमृतं मर्त्येषु।
अयं स जज्ञे ध्रुव आ निषत्तोमर्त्येषुऽमर्त्यस्तनवाउवर्धमानः।।
वि मे कर्णा पतयतो वि चक्षुर्वीदं ज्योतिर्हृदय आहितं यत्।
वि मे मनश्चरति दूरआधीः किं स्विद् वक्ष्यामि किमुनू मनिष्ये।।

Ibid, VI.9.2, 3, 4, 6.

as its eyes, air as its breath, space as its volume, water as its wealth, earth as its feet, sacrificial altar as its chest and various fires as its heart, mind and mouth.[1] Even to conceptualise such an all-inclusive and transcendent Being lies beyond the capacity of the normal human mind and not to talk of perceiving and describing it with any sense of precision.

While the Chāndogya explains Vaiśvānara in terms of the building blocks of the universe, the Bṛhadāraṇyaka conceives of it in terms of the thread passing through all those building blocks as also inside each block in itself and thus integrating all of them collectively as well as severally together in an organic form. As the same thread is passing through all the constituents of our personality, namely, the mind and intellect not only integrating them together but also making and sustaining them in their respective the very core of their being, to hear, think and reason about that thread would amount, as the Upanisad puts it, to seeing, hearing, thinking and reasoning about the seer, hearer, thinker and reasoner himself.[2] As the agent of any sort of knowledge cannot act at the same time as the object of that knowledge, the Vedic seer could not but stop himself completely from thinking and reasoning about Vaiśvānara at the apex of his experience of that all-inclusive and all-pervading transcendent being except circumscribing the same in terms of its various facets forming its exteriors.

It is interesting to note incidentally that in both these Upanisadic contexts a common personality plays the role of the main inquirer and that is Uddālaka Āruni with this difference, however, that while in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad he appears as a student, though a highly seasoned one, in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka he emerges as a reputed scholar having courage to question even Yājñavalkya, the paramount sagacious

1. *Ch. Up. V. 11-18.*
2. *Brh. Up. III.7.1-23.*

personality of the time. It suggests the common intent of both the Upanisadic Vidyās, namely, Vaiśvānara and Antaryāmin. Significantly enough, the elements of both these Vidyās are embedded in Bharadvāja's, hymn to Vaiśvānara as discussed above. While Vaiśvānara occurs there as the deity of the humn, the idea of it as the all-integrating thread of the cosmos appears there in the form of the warp and woof of the creation as also the identification of Vaiśvānara himself as the knower of it.

Identification of Vaiśvānara as the real knower of the warp and woof of the creation in contradistinction to the admittance, on the part of the seer, of his total ignorance in regard to it provides us with the real key to the crux of the Vedic epistemology. While speaking out himself in these terms, the seer presents himself obviously as a common man imbued with senses, sense-mind and intellect and hence capable of having right kind of perception, ideation and reasoning. All these capabilities notwithstanding, however, if he feels himself completely at sea in scanning the nature of the warp and the woof as also the weaver of the cloth of creation, it amounts to suggesting the incapability of these sources of knowledge in the comprehension of the ultimate nature of the object of knowledge concerned. This is made doubly sure by his admission a little later that his senses, mind and intellect have failed him when he has come face to face with Vaiśvānara. The seer's position at this point is similar to that of Arjuna in the Bhagavadgītā on seeing the Viśvarūpa of Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Like Bhagavadgītā, Arjuna also gets bewildered on seeing the Lord in his exquisite brilliance, excessive lustre of eyes and all-inclusive vastness and therefore pants for respite.[1] This happens to Arjuna in spite of the fact that he at the moment was privileged to have got substituted his physical eye by the

---

1. नभः स्पृशं दीप्तमनेकवर्णं व्याप्तननं दीप्तविशालनेत्रम्।
दृष्ट्वा हि त्वां प्रव्यचितान्तरात्मा धृतिं न विन्दामि शमच्च विष्णो।।
Bhagavadgītā XI, 24.

divine one, otherwise he would not have been able at all to have any inkling into the Viśvarūpa of the Lord.[1] The physical eye of Arjuna sees Kṛṣṇa as only his companion with all his personal embellishments notwithstanding. Similarly the ordinary eye of the seer sees Vaiśvānara as simply the fire in spite of all its pervasiveness on the universal scale. If he is capable of seeing Vaiśvānara in his true colour as the source as well as real knower of the texture of the universe, he cannot but do so by having his physical eye substituted by some sort of supraphysical one capable of seeing things after the senses, sense-mind as also the intellect have got suspended in their operation.

What is described as divya *cakṣu* in the Bhagavadgītā the same happens to be named as *devaṁ manah* in the Veda. *Devaṁ danaḥ* indeed so prominent a factor in the epistemological scheme of the seer that Dīrghatamas himself in one of his mantras inquires about its source and as is usual with him and indeed with very many seers provides us with the answer also at the same time. "He who knows the Father of the creation below the higher as also above this lower one," the seer observes, "he alone, evincing his seerhood, can tell us about the source of the divine mind."[2] The condition of the knowledge of the source of the divine mind, as laid by Dīrghatamas in this mantra, is kindred to what Bharadvāja laid down for the knowledge of the warp and woof of the creation as discussed above. To remind ourselves of Bharadvāja's condition, according to him also it is only he who knows the warp and woof of the creation, besides being the protector of immortality, can tell us about all this by virtue of his movement below and seeing from above in his transcendent form. The statements of both these seers thus suggest to some sort of coincidence between the epistemic and the

---

1. न तु मां शक्यसे द्रष्टुमनेनैव स्वचक्षुषा।
दिव्यं ददामि ते चक्षुः पश्य मे योगमैश्वरम्।। *Ibid., XI, 8.*

2. अवः परेण पितरं यो अस्यानुवेद पर एनावरेण।

ontological at this highest pinnacle of knowledge. While Bharadvāja amounts of suggest that the warp and woof as also the process of weaving of the cloth of creation can be explained duly by the Creator himself who creates it below and at the same time sees the process of creation form above, Dīrghatamas means to say that he alone can explain the source of the divine mind who knows the Father of the creation in his both the phases, namely, the immanent and the transcendent. The source of *devaṁ manaḥ*, thus, must lie in the creative and cognitive will of the Supreme Being who lays down the warp and woof of the creation on the one hand and is fully cognisant of all this action of himself on the other. Dīrghatamas' statement only confirms this conclusion inasmuch as it contends that person alone can tell us precisely about the source of the *devaṁ manaḥ* who knows the Father in both his phases, i.e., the transcendent and the immanent and at the same time is possessd of the power of expression matching his cognisance.

As regards the state of mind capable of generating such a power of expression, Dirghatamas himself tells us something definite about it in one of his significant mantras bearing an autobiographical note of himself. In this mantra, speaking in the first person the seers observes that he does not know what like he is and moves around as such being driven as a cart by the horse of his mind and that it is only when the first progenies of Rta come to him that he gets the taste of the words of his share.[20] The statement obviously suggests that the horse of mind drawing the cart of life is more or less ignorant of the agency coming occasionally to the seer and communicating to him the words of wisdom forming the mantras. If the mind managing the day-to-day affairs of life is conceivable as a horse, the agency

---

20. कवीयमानः क इह प्र वोचद् देवं मनः कुतो अधि प्रजातम्।। *R.V., I.164.18*
निश्चर्मणे गामरिणीत धीतिभिर्या जरन्ता युवशा ताकृणोतन।
शौधन्वना अस्वादश्वमतक्षता युक्त्वा रथमुप देवाँ अयातन।। *Ibid., I.161.7.*

communicating the words of sagacious wisdom may also be conceived as a horse and has indeed been done so in the Veda itself by very many seers in the legend of Dadhyaṅ. To remind ourselves of the story, Indra imparted the *madhu vidyā* to seer Dadhyaṅ understandably after the latter passed through due quantum of *tapas*. While imparting the *vidyā* he laid down the condition that the same was not to be leaked out to anyone else, otherwise he would be beheaded. After Indra's departure, Aśvins came to Dadhyan and were able to get it leaked out to them though not with the seer's own head but with the head of a horse planted on his body as a substitute of his original head. While Dadhyan's own head was calculative of the interests of life and hence unwilling to be communcative of th secret of the knowledge of bliss, the one substituted for it had nothing to care for the life of the seer and hence let the Aśvins know the secret through it with all the prolificity it naturally possessed and allowed itself to be cut away by Indra after accomplishing the task it was entrusted with and therein laid its divinehood.

Kindred is the message communicated through one of the four wonderful accomplishments of the Ṛbhus by virtue of which they are said to have attained to immortality. While the other three are division of a bowl into four ones, restoration of a cow out of a piece of her hide and rejuvenation of his parents, the relevant one lies in drawing a horse out of a horse or alternatively out of the mind and thus managing the cart of their life be drawn by the two horses towards its divine destiny in a homogenous way.[1] The original horse out of which the second one evolved is the ordinary human mind engrossed in managing the affairs of life. The horse evolved out of it, on the other hand, is the *devaṁ manaḥ* drawing the chariot of life, of course, in association with the former one, to its divine destiny. That the *devam manah* about the source of which the same seer made

---

1. तुच्छ्येनाभ्वपिहितं यदासीत् तपसस्तन् महिताजायतैकम्। *Ibid., X.129.3*

the query and answered in terms of the knowledge of the Creator, can be drawn out of the ordinary mind is no doubt a mysterious proposition, but is explicable through reference to a statement made in the hymn of creation to the effect that in the process of creation there is a stage where the extremely flimsy can hid the all-comprehending which therefore can be found out by removing the former by means of *tapas*.[1] This mantra, as a matter of fact, apparently refers to the process of creation, entail as it does account of darkness covered by darkness in the beginning as also that of water engulfing all this whatever. But involvement of *tapas* in the discovery of the all-comprehending as also of inconscience attributed to water engulfing all this is sufficient to suggest that this account of creation has its source in the psychic experience of the seer himself. Thus he visualises the possibility of the subsistence of some sort of dense darkness by the removal of which something all-comprehending got discovered, on the basis of the psychic experience in which the ordinary mind when penetrated through discloses from within it a principle of knowledge all-comprehensively luminous. This interpretation gets confirmed by the immediately following mantra of the hymn in which the associate of existence is said to have been discovered by seers from within the non-existent through a combination of intense aspiration in the heart and effort of the intellect. The associate of existence cannot but be the consciousness of the same as is borne out by the concept of Saccidānanda in which it is *cit* which is placed close to *sat*. Besides it, the mantra also refers to mind particularly as a source of desire.[2] Indeed if we think of the contents of the two hemistiches of the mantra in opposition to each other's, *manas* comes to the associate of *sat* as *manas* and *asat* are presented here as

---

1. कामस्तदग्रे समवर्तताधि मनसो रेतः प्रथमं यदासीत्।
सतो बन्धुमसति निरविन्दन् हृदि प्रतीष्या कवयो मनीषा।। *Ibid., X.129.4*
2. *Ch. Up. VII.*

the sources of *kāma* and the associate of *sat* respectively. On account of bearing its correspondence with the associate of *sat*, the *kāma* referred to here cannot be treated as any ordinary one. It must be aspiration of the heart for the higher consciousness capable of bearing correspondence with existence instead of remaining entangled in disparate objects and events of the world, as is the case with the desires of the ordinary mind.

On account of its equivalence with *asat*, therefore, the ordinary mind can very well be taken as the *tuccha* of the seer and hence as the point of emergence of *ābhu*, the all-comprehending. This account seems, thus, to be a cryptic forerunner of what sage Sanatkumāra explains to Nārada as recounted in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad subsequently. In the Upaniṣad also Narada is asked by the sage to meditate on Vak and, via it, on mind and intellect in their various aspects so as to reach ultimately the boundless of *bhūmā*, the principle or state of absolute abundance and luminosity.[1]

That there is a mind other than the ordinary one, luminous, ever awake, immortal, source of all knowledge, common to all and functions from within the heart rather than through the brain is evident from the Siva Samkalpa mantras of the Yajurveda. It is characterised as divine, most luminous among all the luminaries and as operative in all the states of life, i.e., wakefulness, dream, and dreamless sleep.[2] It is supposed to be the immortal light of consciousness working as super intellect and the principle of constancy from within the flux of the ordinary mind.[3] It is said to take all the three phases of time, i.e. the past, present and future in its fold together in its all-comprehending immortality

1. यज्जाग्रतो दूरमुदैति दैवं तदु सुप्तस्य तथैवैति।
दूरङ्गमं ज्योतिषां ज्योतिरेकं तन्मे मनः शिवसंङ्कल्पमस्तु।। *YV.34.1.*
2. यत् प्रज्ञानमुत चेतो धृतिश्च यज्ज्योतिरन्तरमृतं प्रजासु।
यस्मान्न ऋते किं चन कर्म क्रियते तन्मे मनः शिवसंकल्पमस्तु।। *Ibid.,34.3.*
3. येनेदं भूतं भुवनं भविष्यत् परिगृहीतममृतेन सर्वम्। *Ibid., 34.4.*

as also to serve as the basic wisdom manifest through the three Vedas by virtue of serving as the common spiritual principle behind all individual psychic formations.[1] Indeed, in view of his awareness of the operation of such a mind from within his heart, the seer does not need at all to be anyway inauspicious in his determinations. Even then if he is anyway apprehensive of inauspiciousness of his determinations, that is all owing to the parallel presence of the ordinary mind. While uttering the words *tanme manaḥ siva saṁkalpam astu* so repeatedly in the hymn what the seer, thus, aspires for concerns not so much the desire for getting the determinations of his ordinary mind become purged of inauspicious elements innate to it as the wish for getting awakened in him the higher mind with all its auspiciousness inherent in it by virtue of being divine, immortal, universalistic, and common source of the Vedic wisdom.

Thus it is evident that *devaṁ manaḥ* of the Vedic seer serving as the source of the Vedic wisdom as embodied in the mantras, though apparently emerging out of the ordinary mind, is not just an extension or enlargement of the same. While the ordinary mind is atomistic, individualistic, divisive, exclusive, bound to the states of wakefulness and dream, sporadic, fleeting, mortal and susceptible to inauspiciousness in its determinations, *devaṁ manaḥ* is constant, all-inclusive, luminous, universalistic and absolutely auspicious in its operation. It is indeed a replica or epistemic formulation of the principle of Rta as operating from within the inner being of the humans. In view of these features of it, one can venture to state that it in essence is the same as what has been called by Sri Aurobindo as Supermind topping over not only the ordinary mind but also the higher mind, illumined mind, intuition and overmind as visualised by him as the staircase for ascension from mind to supermind. As

1. यस्मिन्नृचः सामयजूँषि यस्मिन् प्रतिष्ठिता रथनाभा विवाराः।
यस्मिंश्चित्तं सर्वमोतं प्रजानां तन्मे मनः शिवसङ्कल्पमस्तु।। *Ibid.*, 34.5.

explained by Sri Aurobindo himself, they indeed are the result of intermixture of the traits of the mind and the supermined with a definite diminution in the ratio of the mind as one ascends upward from the higher mind to the overmind. The Veda, of course, is not so categorical as Sri Aurobindo on this point inasmuch as it usually takes a clear jump from mind to *devaṁ manaḥ* without caring much for the intermediate states of saturation. If the intermediate states of saturation happen to be referred to at all, they are done so only in brief and suggestively rather than in any explicit detail. We can take as an illustration the mantra from the Kaṭha Upaniṣad inasmuch as while envisaging a gradation in the total spectrum of the reality it places the sense organs just above the mundane objects and arranges the sensations, sense-mind, intellect, great Ātman, the Unmanifest and the highest Being in an ascending order.[1]

This gradation includes in its ambit both the subject and the object. The objective world is brought in suggestively by describing the senses as higher than something which cannot but be taken to refer to the tangible world around and observer. From the human viewpoint, the world around us is useless unless and until it is subjected to observation. As such, the entire relevance of the world around us is dependent on our tools of observation, i.e., the senses. Herein lies their superiority over the tangible world around us in the eye of the sage. But the senses themselves are just a tool used by the sense-mind for coming into contact with that world through them, as whatever the senses receive from the outside world in the form of sense-datum, deposite the same in the sense-mind to be processed and reconstructed by it. Thus, what we perceive of the outside world is not the world

---

1. इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था अर्थेभ्यः परं मनः।
मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिः बुद्धेरात्मा महान् परः।
महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात् पुरुषः परः।
पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित् सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः।। *Katha Up. III.10-11.*

itself but just a reconstruction of it out of the bits of sense-data impinging on our sense organs. Being fragmentary and superficial in nature, the sense-datum can by no means be expected to represent the actual world around us really as it is. Whatever we understand about the outside world through the senses is obviously due to participation of the sense-mind in this act of understanding. As such, what the scientists before 1930 understood as purely objective and hence as actually lying over there, was to a great extent unture. Even then, however, their observations tallied to a large extent with the actual, as is borne out by effective application of scientific laws and devices on them. If the sense-mind reconstructs the world around us effectively for the use of the commonsense, the intellect refines the same to the extent of derivation of universal laws out of it both scientific and philosophical. As such, what Sri Aruobindo calls higher mind, may very well be identified in the form of the Vedic *Buddhi*. At this level the observer may be taken to contribute to the understanding broadly as much as the object observed over there opening thus the possibility of going into the heart of nature and constructing scientific devices matching to a certain extent the products of nature themselves.

Of course, the observer-observed-participatory view of the reality as mooted out and developed by the scientific theories of quantum mechanics, uncertainty and complementary is much more implicit in the Sāṁkhya view of perception inasmuch as it admits the fact of projection of mental modifications on objects in course of their perception as compared to the case of Nyaya where the sense-datum itself is supposed to travel over to the sense organ. Such marginal differences notwithstanding, in the perspective of the Vedic tradition valid knowledge has always been regarded as a result of participation of the knower and the known in the act of knowing. Significantly enough, this view of knowledge has come to coincide with latest developments in science in sharp contravention of the earlier ones. As against

the expectation of absolute precision in scientific knowledge, when the sub-atomic particle as the newly discovered building-block of the universe was found out sometimes as a wave and sometimes as a particle, the scientist could not but admit a drastic change in his theory of knowledge acknowledging therein the significant participatory role of the knower in the act of knowing.

There are grades in the act of participation of the knower in the process of knowing. The subject and the object are almost immune to each other prior to coming into contact with each other. The contact begins with the operation of the senses on the object as something wholly other than themselves. With adequate deepening in the contact, however, the otherness goes on giving way to sameness until at last both the knower and the known become not only mutually participatories but one and the same. This syzygy of the subject and the object is the crux of the Vedic epistemology. It is evident in seers seeing and speaking with the eye and tongue of gods. Glaring examples are Viśvāmitra, Vāmadeva, and Vāgāmbhṛṇī.

Viśvāmitra prays to Agni in hundreds of mantras recounting features of the deity in various ways taking the latter as independent of himself. But there is a set of three mantras coming towards almost the end of those addressed to that deity in which the subject-object relationship takes a sharp turn as a result of which the seer does no more remain Viśvāmitra but appears in the opposite role of the object of description coinciding with the addressee of the prayer itself. He unequivocally points to himself as Agni and that also not just the ordinary one but straightaway as the primeval source of awareness not anyway acquired but inherent.

This shift in the seer's outlook towards Agni raises the question as to why he took the trouble of praying to Agni in so many verses when he himself was Agni from the very beginning of his life. It shows that the experience of his identity with Agni

was the culmination of the process of sustained devotion to the deity and not just incidental. In such a case, *janmanā* would mean "essentially." This interpretation accords well with the life-history of the seer, involve as it does several ups and downs in the graph of his *sādhanā*. Once he has reached the highest point in the course of his *sādhanā*, however, no more is he required to traverse that course, as the sense of his identity with the Deity has become a settled matter of constant realisation. Now he feels as if he were Agni from the very beginning of his life. Experience of one's identity with something from one's birth is suggestive of totality as also essentiality of the experience. In this spectrum of experience, he comes to visualise his eyesight as the focal point of the sacrificial fire burning the *ghṛta* poured into it or indeed as the focal point of the universe in the form of the sun not only burning constantly whatever is offered to it but also creating the world around it. He at the same time conceives of himself also as the oblation put into the fire of himself.[1] Thus he feels himself as the consumer and the consumed both in one and the same strain.

Such an experience is impossible without getting entry into the core of his being forming the source of pure consciousness. How the seer got to this core of his being coinciding with the core of the universal being itself is evident from the sequel of the mantra in which the seer speaks of himself rather objectiely in the third person as one who by means of his intellect, *prāṇa* and inner self as representatives of Agni, Vāyu and Sūya on the individual scale got purified the spiritual light embodied in his inmost being. As a consequence of this act of purification, he by means of the powers of his inner being came eventually to inculcate in him the state of highest beatitude followed by

---

1. अग्निरस्मि जन्मना जातवेदा घृतं मे चक्षुरमृतं म आसन्।
अर्कस्त्रिधातू रजसो विमानोऽजस्रो घर्मो हविरस्मि नाम।। *RV. III.26.7.*

seeing the world around him from that enlightened and beatific viewpoint.[1]

The next and last *mantra* in the hymn describes the inmost being of the individual entered into through these acts of self-purification and elevation figuratively as a reservoir of water flowing out in hundreds of streams and yet remaining undiminished, as a being seeing all around himself, as the source of all sagacious words and statements, as coincident to the Reality itself and as the source of delight in the universe.[2] This depiction shows that the inmost being of the individual is oceanic in its expanse and depth, exclusively conscious and coincident to the reality in its content and as such the source of all wisdom and delight in the world. It is in the same tradition that the small space inside the human heart came to be visualised in the Upaniṣad as expansive as the space outside or even more than that, as inclusive of the heaven and the earth, the fire and the air, the sun and the moon, the lightning, planets and stars as also what is not there in the external world.[3] The description looks funny inasmuch as it talks of the apparently so tiny a space in the heart as so inclusive as to take the entire space-time centinuum itself in its fold. But its funniness gives way to amazement when we take into account the immensity of the potentialities of the human mind seeking successfully to measure out the entire universe in all its spatio-temporal magnitude as evidenced by the achievements of Albert Einstein, Werner Heisenberg, Neils Borg, Rāmānujan, Subrahmanyan, Chandrasekhar, Stephen Hawking

---

1. त्रिभिः पवित्रैरपुंपोद्ध्यर्कं हृदा मतिं ज्योतिरनु प्रजानन्।
वर्षिष्ठं रत्नमकृत स्वधाभिरादिद् द्यावापृथिवी पर्यपश्यत्।। *Ibid., III.26.8.*
2. शतधारमुत्समक्षीयमाणं विपश्चितं पितरं वक्त्वानाम्।
मेळिं मदन्तं पित्रोरुपस्थे तं रोदसी पिपृतं सत्यवाचम्।। *Ibid., III.26.9.*
3. यावान् वा अयमाकाशस्तावानेषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशः। उभे अस्मिन् द्यावापृथिवी अन्तरेव समाहिते। उभावग्निश्च वायुश्च सूर्याचन्द्रमसावुभौ विद्युन्नक्षत्राणि। यच्चास्येहास्ति यच्च नास्ति सर्वं तदस्मिन् समाहितम्। *Ch.Up. VIII.1.3.*

and many more of the sort.

No matter, whether one starts one's probing into the mystery of the universe and life in it from the side of science through the intermediation of his senses and the sense-mind or through intuition directly, the real source of his insight into things is in any case his inmost being itself. As a matter of fact, relatively higher achievements in science itself have come more often intuitively than inductively as is evidenced by the life histories of Newton, Einstein, Ramanujan, Chandrasekhar et al. In all such cases, induction and experimentation has been used just to consolidate and actualise what happened to be achieved by a sudden stroke of intuition. In view of this state of things in the field of knowledge, what differentiates the Vedic seer from the modern scientist is his obvious deficiency in inclination as also in the infrastructure necessary for actualisation of his intuitive insights into things tangible. Otherwise intuitively he was much more prolific than modern scientists and thinkers themselves as is evident from his astounding achievements in ideation. The hundreds of streams flowing out of the core of the human psyche, as vsualised by the Vedic seer, are indeed indicative of the potentialities of the human mind yet to be actualised beyond science even or at least beyond what it stands at the moment.

The immensity of the potentialities of the human mind in itself has for its basis the capability of consciousness to go deepest possible into things material as well as immaterial. This capability of consciousness in its turn suggests to the point of coincidence between matter and consciousness. In view of the wider range of consciousness extending even beyond the space-time continuum, the secret of coincidence between matter and consciousness is much more likely to lie in the primacy of the latter than that of the former. Indeed, while matter is a product

of the space-time continuum, consciousness by virtue of defying the confinements of the continuum, can very well be regarded as the very source of the latter. That it defies the confinements of the continuum is evident from the immensity of the human psyche with its location in the tiny space of the human heart on one hand and its accessibility beyond space and time on the other as visualised by the Upanisadic sage.

Thus it is by virtue of the power of meditativeness inherent in him or developed by him discreetly the Vedic seer had reached the very source of consciousness in all its pristine purity and visualised things outside from that psychic depth or spiritual height in his own supramental way and happened to set out formulations of lasting value, not only philosophically but also to a great extent scientifically. Herein lies the secret of the impersonal and divine origin of the Veda.

❑ ❑ ❑

भारविकाव्य-वैभवम्

डॉ. रामसेवक दुबे
प्राध्यापक, संस्कृत-विभाग
इलाहाबाद-विश्वविद्यालय

लौकिक संस्कृत साहित्य में आदि कवि वाल्मीकि से आरम्भ करके आधुनिककाल तक के महाकवियों की एक लम्बी शृङ्खला है। इस शृङ्खला में एक से बढ़कर एक महाकवि अवतरित हुए हैं, जिनके जिह्वाग्र पर भगवती वीणापाणि के अलौकिक नर्तन से उद्भूत सहृदय–संवेद्य लोकोत्तर काव्यधारा प्रवाहित हुई है। इन महाकवियों के विषय में प्रवर एवम् अवर का निर्धारण (वस्तुतः गुणावगुण के आधार पर) अत्यन्त कठिन है। काव्यधारा के इस अमन्दानन्दरसनिष्यन्द में आप्लावित होते हुए अनेक प्रख्यातनामा संस्कृत समालोचकों ने विविधविध रत्नों का अन्वेषण किया है। किसी के हाथ में बहुमूल्य तो किसी के हाथ में अमूल्य रत्न लगे। इन समालोचकों ने उन रत्नों की चमचमाहट के आधार पर और प्रायः काव्यप्रतिभा, अलङ्कारप्रदर्शन एवं छन्दो योजना आदि के आधार पर महाकवियों की आपेक्षिक वरीयता का निर्धारण करने का प्रयास किया है। इसी तारतम्य में इन महाकवियों के सम्बन्ध में अनेक प्रशंसापरक उक्तियाँ उपलब्ध होती हैं। उदाहरणार्थ– कविकुलगुरु कालिदास के उपमालङ्कारप्रयोगों की सर्वाङ्गीण सुन्दरता संस्कृत जगत् में विश्रुत है, महाकवि भारवि के अर्थगौरव की प्रशंसा शीर्ष पर प्रतिष्ठित है, महाकवि दण्डी का पदलालित्य समालोचकों द्वारा बहुधा प्रशस्त्य है, महाकवि श्रीहर्ष के भी पदलालित्य की प्रशंसा सुनने में आती है, महाकवि माघ के अभिनवपदप्रयोगप्रकर्ष और उक्त तीनों गुणों की प्रतिष्ठा के विषय में भी समालोचकवृन्द निरन्तर जागरूक रहे हैं, महाकवि बाण को तो कविताकाननकेसरी के रूप में प्रतिष्ठित करते हुए उनके द्वारा सम्पूर्ण काव्यजगत् को उच्छिष्ट बताने वाली उक्ति भी संस्कृत साहित्य के

समालोचकों के बीच बहुप्रचलित है। एक श्लोक के माध्यम से कालिदास, भारवि, दण्डी और माघ के काव्यकौशल का उल्लेख संस्कृतानुरागियों में अति सुपरिचित है–

उपमा कालिदासस्य भारवेरर्थगौरवम्।
दण्डिनः पदलालित्यं माघे सन्ति त्रयो गुणाः।।

सम्प्रति महाकवि भारवि के अर्थगौरव रूप काव्य वैभव के विषय में विचार करना है तो आइये देखें कि भारवि के सम्बन्ध में कथित यह काव्यवैभव वस्तुतः है क्या ? इसके सम्यग् ज्ञान के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि 'अर्थगौरव' पद की सारी व्याख्याओं तथा तद्विषयक धारणाओं को समुचित रूप से समझने की चेष्टा की जाय। इसके विषय में समालोचकों के द्वारा अनेक प्रकार की धारणाओं का विवेचन किया जाता रहा है, जिनको अग्रलिखित रूप में स्पष्ट रूप से देखा जा सकता है–

१. अर्थ की गम्भीरता,
२. गागर में सागर भर देना,
३. अर्थ की गुरुता,
४. अर्थान्तरन्यास अलङ्कार का प्रयोग,
५. एक शब्द में अनेक अर्थों का समावेश,
६. अत्यन्त सुस्पष्ट अर्थालङ्कारों का प्रयोग,
७. गम्भीर दार्शनिक एवं सार्वभौम अर्थ प्रतिपादित करने वाली सूक्तियों का प्रयोग,
८. धर्मशास्त्रीय तथ्यों का सूक्ष्म विवेचन,
९. नीति, राजनीति एवं कूटनीति का अत्यन्त कुशलतापूर्वक विवेचन,
१०. व्याकरण का विशिष्ट प्रयोग,
११. अत्यन्त गूढ अथवा एकाक्षरी छन्दों में विहित विशिष्ट अर्थों की स्थापना,
१२. सौष्ठव एवम् औदार्य के विशेष से विभूषित तथ्य विनिश्चित अर्थ को प्रकट करने वाला अभिप्राय,

१३. पदों के द्वारा अनावृत एवं स्पष्ट प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ का प्राकट्य।

उपर्युक्त कथनों के द्वारा आलोचकों ने भारवि के अर्थगौरव रूप काव्य वैभव को स्पष्ट करने का प्रयत्न किया है। अर्थगौरव के प्रतिपादक उक्त कथनों के अन्तर्गत किस कथन को निर्विवाद एवं सङ्गत रूप में ग्रहण किया जाय? यह एक यक्ष प्रश्न है। *'मुण्डे-मुण्डे मतिर्भिन्ना कुण्डे-कुण्डे नवं पयः'* इत्यादि लोकोक्तियाँ यहाँ अर्थवती होती हुई प्रतीत होने लगती हैं। सम्प्रति महाकवि भारवि में अर्थगौरव को प्रतिपादित करने वाली ये समस्त उक्तियाँ सङ्गत हैं अथवा नहीं या इनमें से कुछ उक्तियाँ अर्थगौरव को प्रतिपादित करने वाली हैं और अधिकांश विषय से भटक गयी हैं, इसका क्रमशः विवेचन करके ही भारवि के काव्यवैभव का समुचित प्रतिपादन किया जा सकता है–

१. उपर्युक्त बिन्दुओं में से प्रथम तीन अर्थात् 'अर्थ की गम्भीरता', 'गागर में सागर भरना' और 'अर्थ की गुरुता' में – अर्थतः कोई भेद नहीं है। एक ही बात को इन तीन वाक्यों से प्रकट करके अर्थगौरव के स्वरूप को प्रतिपादित किया जाता है। इन वाक्यों से वस्तुतः अर्थगौरव की विशेषता तो प्रकट होती है, परन्तु इसका स्वरूप बहुत कुछ अस्पष्ट एवं जटिल ही बना रह जाता है।

२. 'अर्थान्तरन्यास अलङ्कारों का प्रयोग', 'एक शब्द में अनेक अर्थों का समावेश' और 'अत्यन्त सुस्पष्ट अर्थालङ्कारों के प्रयोग' के बल पर 'भारवेरर्थगौरवम्' इस उक्ति को प्रतिपादित करना सर्वथा अतार्किक अस्पष्ट और भ्रामक है; क्योंकि अर्थान्तरन्यास और श्लेष अलङ्कारों के प्रयोग में तो एक से बढ़कर एक महाकवि संस्कृत वाङ्मय में सुप्रतिष्ठित हैं। इन अलङ्कारों के प्रयोग में कालिदास, माघ, बाणभट्ट, श्रीहर्ष इत्यादि महाकवि भी भारवि से किसी भी प्रकार कम नहीं हैं। अर्थान्तरन्यास के आधार पर अर्थगौरव की स्थापना यदि की जाती है तो यह अर्थगौरव तो सभी महाकवियों में प्रायः अर्थान्तरन्यास प्रयोग के कारण सहज ही सिद्ध है। अत्यन्त सुस्पष्ट अर्थालङ्कारों के प्रयोग से अथवा विविध अलङ्कारों के रमणीय प्रयोगों के आधार पर भारवि में अर्थगौरव की स्थापना उचित नहीं है, क्योंकि काव्यशास्त्र के आचार्यों के अनुसार अलङ्कारों के प्रयोग से काव्य की उत्कृष्टता का प्रतिपादन नहीं किया जा सकता। अलङ्कार इत्यादि तो काव्य के शोभाधायक तत्त्व हैं। अलङ्कारों के प्रयोग से वस्तुतः

सुन्दरता में अभिवृद्धि होती है, न कि सुन्दरता के अभाव में अलङ्कारों का प्रचुर प्रयोग सौन्दर्योत्पादक होता है। काव्य तो अलङ्कारहीन भी हो सकता है। उदाहरण में आचार्य मम्मट के *"स्फुटालङ्कारविरहेऽपि न काव्यत्वहानिः'* वाक्य को ग्रहण किया जा सकता है। अतः अलङ्कारों के प्रयोग के बल पर 'भारवेरर्थगौरवम्' सिद्ध नहीं किया जा सकता है।

३. 'गम्भीर दार्शनिक अर्थ को प्रतिपादित करने वाली सूक्तियों' और 'सार्वभौम अर्थ को प्रतिपादित करने वाली सूक्तियों' के पर्याप्त प्रयोग के द्वारा महाकवि भारवि की कविता के अर्थ बड़े ही गौरवास्पद और प्रशंसनीय माने जाते हैं। सूक्तियों के प्रायः प्रयोगों के द्वारा 'भारवेरर्थगौरवम्' उक्ति प्रचलित हुई, यह तर्क भी बहुत प्रौढ़ नहीं है; क्योंकि यह वैशिष्ट्य तो न केवल महाकाव्यों में अपितु मुक्तकों, गीतिकाव्यों और कथासाहित्य के अन्तर्गत पदे–पदे दर्शनीय है। यदि अर्थगौरव के हेतु के विषय में संस्कृत साहित्य के समालोचकों का यही अभिप्राय है, तो प्रकृत के आधार पर प्रतिपादित यह अर्थगौरव नीतिशतक, वैराग्यशतक, शृङ्गारशतक, भामिनीविलास तथा पञ्चतन्त्र एवम् अनेक सुभाषित सङ्ग्रहों में अपनी पराकाष्ठा पर प्रतिपादित हुआ है। तब तो भारवि की अपेक्षा अर्थगौरव का कथन भर्तृहरि, पण्डितराज और विष्णुशर्मा आदि कवियों के वैशिष्ट्य के रूप में संस्कृत काव्यजगत् में स्वीकार किया जाना चाहिए। अतः भारवेरर्थगौरवम्' के प्रस्थापक कारणों के अन्तर्गत यह आधार भी सर्वथा निराधार है।

४. 'धर्मशास्त्रीय तथ्यों का सूक्ष्म विवेचन' तथा 'नीतिक्', 'राजनीतिक' एवं 'कूटनीतिक' तथ्यों को प्रतिपादित करने वाले काव्य में अर्थगौरव का कथन भी सर्वथा असङ्गत है; क्योंकि उक्तविषयक मनुस्मृति, चाणक्यनीति, शुक्रनीतिसार, नारदीयस्मृति, मुद्राराक्षसम् नाटक और राजनीति के ग्रन्थ के रूप में कौटिल्य के अर्थशास्त्र आदि अनेक ग्रन्थ हैं। इस आधार पर तो इनमें अर्थगौरव की पराकाष्ठा ही प्रतिपादित होनी चाहिए, जबकि समालोचकों ने इस तथ्य को भी स्वीकार नहीं किया है। भारवि के काव्य के समान अर्थगौरव की प्रतिष्ठा उक्त काव्यों को प्राप्त नहीं हुई।

५. 'व्याकरण के विशिष्ट प्रयोग', 'अत्यन्त गूढ एवम् एकाक्षरी छन्दों की रचना' इत्यादि के आधार पर भी महाकवि भारवि को अर्थगौरव से सम्बद्ध करना बहुत समीचीन प्रतीत नहीं होता है, क्योंकि ये समस्त

विशेषताएँ महाकवि भारवि के पाण्डित्य को प्रदर्शित करती हैं। इस तरह का पाण्डित्य तो संस्कृत जगत् में अतिसामान्य है। अनेक ऐसे कवि हैं, जिनमें कवित्व एवं कल्पनाशक्ति की पराकाष्ठा के साथ–साथ शास्त्रीय पाण्डित्य भी अपने चरमोत्कर्ष पर प्रतिष्ठित हुआ है। व्याकरणशास्त्र के क्षेत्र में तो महाकवियों में भट्टि, महाकवि माघ और व्याकरण तथा दर्शन एवं काव्यगत अन्य विशेषताओं के परम धुरन्धर महाकवि श्रीहर्ष आदि को तो निदर्शन के रूप में मानते हुए समालोचकों के द्वारा अर्थगौरव के पुरोधा के रूप में इन्हें भी स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिये, परन्तु यह नहीं किया गया। अतएव इस पाण्डित्य के आधार पर महाकवि में अर्थगौरव का स्थापन भी तथ्यहीन प्रतीत हो रहा है। समालोचकों का यह मत है कि कवित्व कुछ और ही बात है। पाण्डित्य के कारण कवित्व को महत्त्व कथमपि प्रदान नहीं किया जा सकता है।

इस प्रकार समालोचकों के द्वारा उक्त अधिकांश वाक्यों के आधार पर 'भारवेरर्थगौरवम्' के स्वरूप का प्रतिपादन और इसके अन्तर्गत निहित अभिप्राय का विवेचन या तो अत्यन्त अस्पष्ट है अथवा पर्याप्त अतार्किक है। अतएव भारवि के अर्थगौरव को यदि उपर्युक्त स्वरूप में कोई समझता है या समझाता है तो वह निश्चित ही भ्रामक होकर यथार्थ से सुदूर स्थित होगा।

वस्तुतः अर्थगौरव के अभिप्राय के विषय में जो कुछ भी उल्लेख किया जा सकता है उसमें स्वयं महाकवि भारवि की पङ्क्तियों से क्या ध्वनित होता है? यह जानकारी इस सन्दर्भ में अत्यन्त महत्त्वपूर्ण है। 'किरातार्जुनीयम्' के प्रथम सर्ग के प्रारम्भ में ही जहाँ वनेचर के द्वारा महाराज युधिष्ठिर के समक्ष वृत्तान्तनिवेदन का प्रसङ्ग आता है, वहाँ महाकवि के द्वारा प्रयुक्त उक्ति में अर्थगौरव की स्पष्ट छाप देखी जा सकती है–

स सौष्ठवौदार्यविशेषशालिनीं
विनिश्चितार्थामिति वाचमाददे।।[1]

इसके साथ ही

विविक्तवर्णाभरणा सुखश्रुतिः
प्रसादयन्ती हृदयान्यपि द्विषाम्।
प्रवर्तते नाकृतपुण्यकर्मणां

---

१. किरातार्जुनीयम् १/३

प्रसन्नगम्भीरपदा सरस्वती।।[1]

—इस श्लोक से भी भारवि के अर्थगौरवविषयक मन्तव्य पर प्रकाश पड़ता है। साथ ही—

स्फुटता न पदैरपाकृता
न च न स्वीकृतमर्थगौरवम्।
रचिता पृथगर्थता गिरां
न च सामर्थ्यमपोहितं क्वचित्।।[2]

—यह श्लोक तो उनकी अर्थगौरवविषयक धारणा का असन्दिग्ध निर्णायक ही प्रतीत होता है।

भारवि के उक्त तीनों वचनों का अर्थनिर्धारण करना आवश्यक है। अतः विचारणीय है कि 'विनिश्चितार्था वाणी' का क्या अर्थ है? उस वाणी के 'सौष्ठवौदार्यविशेषशालिनी' होने का क्या अभिप्राय है? और 'प्रसन्नगम्भीरपदा सरस्वती' का तात्पर्य क्या है? तभी ठीक से जाना जा सकता है कि भारवि किस प्रकार के अर्थगौरव को स्वीकृत किये जाने की बात करते हैं। एतद्विषयक विवेचन अपरिहार्य है। इस विषय के सम्यक् अनुशीलन के पश्चात् ही यह कहा जा सकता है कि महाकवि भारवि में अर्थगौरव है या नहीं—

(१) 'विनिश्चितार्था वाणी' का अर्थ करते हुए टीकाकार मल्लिनाथ ने कहा है कि— **"विनिश्चितार्थां विशेषतः प्रमाणतो निर्णीतार्थामिति वक्ष्यमाणरूपां वाचं वाक्यम्।"** अर्थात् प्रमाणादि से निर्णीत अर्थयुक्त वाणी। यहाँ निस्सन्देह भारवि का यही मन्तव्य है कि काव्य में प्रयुक्त शब्दों के अर्थ सदैव प्रमाणसिद्ध होने चाहिए। प्रमाणसिद्ध अर्थ में स्वाभाविक रूप से अलङ्कारादि सदृश विशेषताओं का प्राधान्य नहीं हो सकता है। वहाँ तो अर्थ की गहराई, अर्थ की असन्दिग्धता और सब प्रकार से प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ की प्रतिष्ठा का ही प्राधान्य होना युक्तियुक्त होगा। कवि के द्वारा वक्ष्यमाण वाक्यार्थ में सर्वथा प्राधान्य तो प्रमाणों का होगा। प्रमाणविहीन अर्थ वाली शाब्दिक एवम् आर्थिक चमत्कारों की अभिव्यक्ति कविता के माध्यम से कवि को अभिप्रेत नहीं है। प्रमाणों के द्वारा शास्त्रों में यथार्थज्ञान को उपदिष्ट

१. तदेव १४/६
२. तदेव २/२७

किया गया है। यथार्थज्ञान प्रमाण से ही सुनिश्चित किया जाता है, जिसकी विवेचना विद्वानों ने पृथक् शास्त्रों में की है। वस्तुतः उन शास्त्रों के बोध से रहित होने पर भारवि की यह मान्यता सम्भवतः सर्वसाधारण के द्वारा समझी नहीं जा सकी, जिसके कारण इसका भ्रान्त अर्थ कुछ लोगों ने ग्रहण कर लिया है। मल्लिनाथ जैसे विद्वानों ने इसे समग्रता से हृदयङ्गम किया क्योंकि वे पद–वाक्य–प्रमाणज्ञ आचार्य थे।

(२) आचार्य मल्लिनाथ ने पुनः 'सौष्ठवौदार्यविशेषशालिनी' के तात्पर्य को निश्चित करते हुए कहा– **"सुष्ठु–भावः सौष्ठवं शब्दसामर्थ्यम्। उदारस्य भावः औदार्यम् अर्थसम्पत्तिः। त एव विशेषः तयोर्वा विशेषः तेन शालते इति सौष्ठवौदार्यविशेषशालिनी।"** अर्थात् शब्दसामर्थ्य या अर्थसम्पत्ति के विशेष या अतिशय से विभूषित वाणी। शब्दसामर्थ्य या अर्थसम्पत्ति का विशेष या अतिशय भी उपर्युक्त अर्थ का ही प्रतिपादक है। महाकवि का आशय इस उक्ति के द्वारा भी यही प्रतीत होता है कि प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ को प्रकट करने की सामर्थ्य शब्द में निहित होनी चाहिये। खींच–तान कर वक्रोक्ति या अन्योक्ति इत्यादि के द्वारा यदि अर्थ का बोध कराया गया तो वहाँ शब्द सामर्थ्यवान् नहीं स्वीकार किया जा सकेगा। समर्थ पदों के अन्तर्गत ही अर्थसम्पत्ति समाहित होगी। अर्थसम्पत्ति का भाव भी अर्थ की गहराई और प्रामाणिकता की ओर ही सङ्केत करता है।

(३) महाकवि भारवि की वाणी प्रसन्न तथा गम्भीर पदों से युक्त होती है। उसके सुन्दर अक्षर अपने स्वरूप से कानों को प्रसन्न करते हैं। वह शत्रुओं के भी हृदय को प्रसन्न करने वाली है। भारवि की शैली का मर्म यही है कि वह प्रसन्न होते हुए गम्भीर है और सहृदय आलोचकों को प्रसन्न करने के साथ ही दुष्टों के हृदय को भी आवर्जित करती है, अतः महाकवि भारवि की भाषा तथा शैली में 'प्रसन्नगम्भीरपदासरस्वती' एक महनीय मन्त्र है। उक्त के तात्पर्य को स्पष्ट करते हुए आचार्य मल्लिनाथ ने अलङ्कार, सूक्ति अथवा नीति इत्यादि से युक्त वाणी के रूप में उपर्युक्त पङ्क्ति का अर्थ ग्रहण नहीं किया अपितु उन्होंने विनिश्चितार्था वाणी, सौष्ठव और औदार्य के द्वारा विशिष्ट वाणी तथा गम्भीरपदा सरस्वती इत्यादि पदों के द्वारा अर्थगौरव का एक लोकोत्तर स्वरूप प्रतिपादित किया है, जिसके अन्तर्गत अलङ्कारों का प्रचुर प्रयोग नहीं है, अपितु प्रमाणों के द्वारा विनिर्णीत अर्थ वाली वाणी है। सूक्तियों और पाण्डित्यपूर्ण पदों के

प्रयोग से अर्थगौरव नहीं अपितु इनसे प्रतिपाद्य व्यङ्ग्य अर्थ अभिव्यक्त होता है। प्रसादादि गुणों से युक्त रसपेशल, सहृदयावर्जक, अत्यन्त गहरे अर्थ को धारण किये हुए शाब्दी–सौष्ठव अभिव्यक्त होता है। यहाँ यही कहना उचित है कि काव्य के द्वारा प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ में प्राणतत्त्व तो उसका व्यङ्ग्य अर्थ है। अभिधा के द्वारा अभिधेयार्थ अथवा मुख्यार्थ या वाक्यार्थ तो सामान्यजनसंवेद्य होता है। अतएव महाकवि भारवि के द्वारा अङ्गीकृत अर्थगौरव में व्यङ्ग्यार्थ का प्राधान्य ही है और यही महाकवि के द्वारा स्वीकृत अर्थगौरव है। इस प्रकार अर्थगौरव के सम्बन्ध में बहुप्रचलित ये कथन ही सर्वथा सङ्गत हैं, अवधार्य हैं तथा निर्भ्रान्त हैं।

निष्कर्षतः इन्हीं तीन–चार श्लोकों के आधार पर 'भारवेरर्थगौरवम्' उक्ति संस्कृत काव्यजगत् में स्थापित हुई है। इसी तात्पर्य का उद्घोष करते हुए महाकवि भारवि का यह श्लोक–

स्फुटता न पदैरपाकृता
न च न स्वीकृतमर्थगौरवम्।
रचिता पृथगर्थता गिरां
न च सामर्थ्यमपोहितं क्वचित्।।[1]

यह प्रतिपादित करता है कि पदों की स्फुटता, पृथगर्थता तथा शब्दसामर्थ्य तथा अभीष्ट–अर्थ–प्रतिपादन को स्वीकार करते हुए अर्थगौरव को स्वीकार नहीं किया गया है, ऐसा नहीं है अर्थात् उक्त विशेषताओं के साथ–साथ अर्थगौरव को निश्चितरूप से स्वीकार किया गया है। अर्थगौरव के अन्तर्गत महाकवि ने प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ को स्थापित करने का सफल प्रयत्न किया है। यही प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ ही व्यङ्ग्य होकर अर्थगौरव का रूप धारण करता है। इस प्रकार निर्गलितार्थ के रूप में यह कहा जा सकता है कि रसानुभूति कराने वाले विनिश्चित अर्थ के प्रतिपादक अथवा सङ्गत अर्थ को स्पष्ट करने वाले पदों से युक्त काव्य ही महाकवि भारवि को अभीष्ट है। दूसरे शब्दों में सुनिश्चित अर्थ को प्रतिपादित करते हुए समस्त सन्देहविगलित अर्थ को प्रतिपादित करने वाले पदों के द्वारा काव्यरचना ही महाकवि भारवि को अभीष्ट है। सङ्गतार्थ के प्रतिपादन में वह प्रत्येक प्रयत्न करते हैं, जिसके द्वारा काव्यार्थ सन्देहरहित स्वरूप में प्रतिपादित हो सके। उन्होंने वक्रोक्ति, अन्योक्ति अथवा काकु या भङ्गीभणिति इत्यादि आलङ्कारिक शैली को प्रधानता से अङ्गीकृत नहीं किया, जिससे अर्थनिष्पादन में कहीं

---

१. किरातार्जुनीयम् २/२७

श्रोता स्वतंत्र होकर अर्थ के गाम्भीर्य को अस्वीकृत कर सकें। भारवि प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ का प्रतिपादन तब तक करते हैं जब तक विनिश्चितार्थ अभिव्यक्त नहीं हो जाता है; भले ही उन्हें उस प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ को स्थापित करने में अनेक श्लोकों की रचना करनी पड़े। इसीलिए प्रायः अर्थगौरव के शब्दार्थ के रूप में गागर में सागर भर देना भी श्रोताओं को भ्रान्त करने लगता है। उन्होंने अल्प शब्दों के द्वारा बृहद् अर्थों का प्रतिपादन नहीं किया है, क्योंकि प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ या विनिश्चितार्थ सदैव संक्षिप्त हुआ करता है। अतः विनिश्चितार्थ के प्रतिपादन में बहुधा अल्प शब्दों का प्रयोग सम्भव नहीं है। विनिश्चितार्थ के प्रतिपादन में तो कदाचित् व्यापक विवेचन की आवश्यकता पड़ती है और इस व्यापक विवेचन में पण्डितप्रकाण्ड कवि के पदों में विविध अलङ्कारों, ललित पदों, सुन्दर छन्दों, सार्थक सूक्तियों आदि का प्रदर्शन तो स्वाभाविक रूप से होगा ही परन्तु भाषा के प्रवाह में आने वाले ये समस्त उपकारक तत्त्व कथमपि अर्थगौरव नहीं हो सकते; परम्परया अर्थगौरव के हेतु के रूप में ही इन्हें स्वीकार किया जा सकता है। अर्थगौरव तो 'सौष्ठवौदार्यविशेषशालिनीम्' इत्यादि के द्वारा प्रतिपादित कोई और ही तत्त्व है, जिसका सम्यग् विवेचन विगत में किया गया है।

अर्थगौरव को प्रकट करने वाले श्लोकों से मण्डित किरातार्जुनीयम् महाकाव्य बृहत्त्रयी में सर्वोपरि है। इसके प्रथम सर्ग से ही भारवि की अर्थगौरव सम्बन्धी प्रवृत्ति न केवल प्रकट होने लगती है अपितु इसके स्वरूप का निर्धारण भी महाकवि ने इस सर्ग के प्रारम्भ में ही कर दिया है–

द्विषां विघाताय विधातुमिच्छतो
रहस्यनुज्ञामधिगम्य भूभृतः।
स सौष्ठवौदार्यविशेषशालिनीं
विनिश्चितार्थामिति वाचमाददे।।[1]

यह पद्य सर्ग का प्रारम्भिक श्लोक है, जिसमें विनिश्चित अर्थ की चर्चा की गयी। द्वितीय सर्ग में महाकवि ने पुनः यही तात्पर्य प्रतिष्ठित करते हुए– ''स्फुटता न पदैरपाकृता.....'' इत्यादि का प्रतिपादन किया है। अर्थगौरव की स्थापना को पराकाष्ठा पर पहुँचाते हुए महाकवि ने चौदहवें

---

१. किरातार्जुनीयम् १/३

सर्ग में– *"विविक्तवर्णाभरणा सुखश्रुतिः*.......इत्यादि के द्वारा अपने मन्तव्य को दृढ़ता से प्रकट किया है। इस दिशा में सङ्केत करने वाले और भी अनेक श्लोकों की प्राप्ति होती है, जो अर्थगौरव या अर्थगाम्भीर्य को विषय बनाकर प्रवृत्त होते हुए समालोचकों को दिखते हैं–

परप्रणीतानि वचांसि चिन्वतां
प्रवृत्तिसाराः खलु मादृशां गिरः।।[1]

अपवर्जितविप्लवे शुचौ
हृदयग्राहिणि मङ्गलास्पदे।
विमला तव विस्तरे गिरां
मतिरादर्श इवाभिदृश्यते।।[2]

उदारचेता गिरमित्युदारां
द्वैपायनेनाभिदधे नरेन्द्रः।।[3]

भवन्ति ते सभ्यतमा विपश्चितां
मनोगतं वाचि निवेशयन्ति ये।
नयन्ति तेष्वप्युपपन्ननैपुणा
गभीरमर्थं कतिचित्प्रकाशताम्।।[4]

स्तुवन्ति गुर्वीमभिधेयसंपदं
विशुद्धिमुक्तेरपरे विपश्चितः।
इति स्थितायां प्रतिपूरुषं रुचौ
सुदुर्लभाः सर्वमनोरमा गिरः।।[5]

भारवि के द्वारा प्रतिपादित अर्थगौरव या विनिश्चितार्थ उनके महाकाव्य से उद्धृत कुछ दृष्टान्तों के द्वारा सुस्पष्ट करना आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है। प्रथम सर्ग के प्रारम्भ का अग्रलिखित श्लोक दर्शनीय है–

---

१. तदेव १/२५
२. तदेव २/२६
३. तदेव ३/१०
४. तदेव १४/४
५. तदेव १४/५

विशङ्कमानो भवतः पराभवं
नृपासनस्थोऽपि वनाधिवासिनः।
दुरोदरच्छद्मजितां समीहते
नयेन जेतुं जगतीं सुयोधनः।।[1]

इस श्लोक के अन्तर्गत *'दुरोदरच्छद्मजितां जगतीं नयेन जेतुं समीहते'*– इसी अर्थ को महाकवि भारवि प्रतिपाद्य मानते हैं। इसी विनिश्चितार्थ को प्रकट करने के लिये भारवि ने दुर्योधन को परम–नीतिज्ञ बना दिया है; उसे नैतिकता की पराकाष्ठा पर आरूढ कर दिया है; काम, क्रोध, लोभ, मोह, मद एवं मात्सर्य का विजेता सिद्ध कर दिया है; धर्म अर्थ और काम का निरपेक्ष और निष्पक्ष साधक बना दिया है; उसके भृत्य, मित्र और सुहृद् इत्यादि को एक विशेष मान्य स्थिति में पहुँचा दिया है; साम, दान, दण्ड और भेद इन उपायकौशलों में पण्डितप्रकाण्ड बना दिया है। अर्थात् वह दुराचारी दुर्योधन महात्माओं के द्वारा अङ्गीकृत, पराकाष्ठा को प्राप्त उन सद्गुणों से युक्त प्रतीत होने लगा है, जिनके बल पर वह धर्मराज युधिष्ठिर को छल–कपट से परास्त करने के पश्चात् अब नीति के द्वारा भी परास्त करने में समर्थ हो रहा है। महाकवि भारवि इस विनिश्चित अर्थ की गम्भीरता को तब तक प्रतिपादित करते रहते हैं, जब तक जुआरी युधिष्ठिर को परम–जुआरी दुर्योधन से पराजित कराकर और पुनः धर्मराज युधिष्ठिर को जितेन्द्रिय महात्मा दुर्योधन के द्वारा पराजित करना सुनिश्चित नहीं कर देते। अर्थ को गौरव प्रदान करने के लिए और सङ्गतार्थ को निर्बाध स्थापित करने के लिए महाकवि की अत्यन्त तर्कप्रवण बुद्धि इसी प्रकार जगह–जगह प्रखरता से प्रकट हो उठती है।

महौजसो मानधना धनार्चिताः
धनुर्भृतः संयति लधकीर्तयः।
न संहतास्तस्य न भिन्नवृत्तयः
प्रियाणि वाञ्छन्त्यसुभिः समीहितुम्।।[2]

दुर्योधन के सैनिकों से युधिष्ठिर की पराजय अवश्यम्भावी है। कवि ने दुर्योधन के वीर भटों की विविध विशेषताओं का उल्लेख किया है, जो अर्जुन और भीम जैसे महारथियों को भी पराजित करने में निःसन्देह सफल होंगे। असफलता को दिलाने वाली किसी तरह की कोई न्यूनता

१. तदेव १/७

२. तदेव १/१६

उनमें दृष्टिगोचर नहीं होती है। प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ को स्पष्ट करते हुए महाकवि भारवि दुर्योधन के वीर भटों के सद्गुणों का तब तक विवेचन करते हैं, जब तक विनिश्चितार्थ प्रतिपादन के समस्त सन्देह विगलित नहीं हो जाते। कवि कहता है कि दुर्योधन के वीर सैनिक महाबलशाली हैं, महाबलशाली होते हुए परम स्वाभिमानी भी हैं। वे केवल मानधन (स्वाभिमानरूपी धन) से ही युक्त नहीं हैं अपितु दुर्योधन के द्वारा प्रभूत धन से सम्पूजित भी हैं। परिणामतः वे सैनिक शत्रुओं के द्वारा कथमपि विचलित किये जाने योग्य भी नहीं हैं। महाबलशाली होते हुए केवल भीम को ही परास्त करने में समर्थ नहीं हैं अपितु वे सैनिक महाधनुर्धर भी हैं, जिनकी योग्यता से अर्जुन का परास्त होना भी सुनिश्चित है। इनके पराक्रम का यह प्रथम अवसर नहीं है कि इन्हें सन्देह की दृष्टि से देखा जाय अपितु ये वीर भट अनेक बार युद्धों में कीर्ति भी अर्जित कर चुके हैं। अत्यधिक चरित्रवान् होने के कारण सैनिकों में राजा के विरूद्ध परस्पर सङ्गठित होने अथवा विद्रोह करने की आशङ्का भी नहीं की जा सकती है, बल्कि ये वीर भट अपने प्राणों की बलि देकर भी दुर्योधन के ईप्सिततम को सिद्ध करने की आकाङ्क्षा रखने वाले हैं। यहाँ भी इस प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ को महाकवि ने तब तक प्रतिपादित किया जब तक कि उक्त विनिश्चितार्थ का प्रतिपादन सन्देहविरहित नहीं हो गया। कवि का यह प्रतिपाद्य इन उपर्युक्त गुणों के अभाव में सिद्ध नहीं हो सकता, क्योंकि भारवि का यह मत है कि यदि सैनिक अर्थात् वीरभट महाबलशाली न हुआ, स्वाभिमानी न होकर अर्थलोलुप हो गया, यशस्वी और चरित्रवान् न होकर परम स्वार्थी और कृतघ्न हो गया, इनके साथ ही यदि अस्त्र–शस्त्र के संचालन का ज्ञान न होते हुए उसमें मृत्यु का भय आ गया तो ऐसे सैनिक कथमपि युद्ध में विजयी नहीं हो सकते हैं। भारवि की यह अप्रतिम कला और प्रमाणादि से युक्तियुक्त प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ को बोधित करना ही अर्थगौरव की स्थापना का प्राणतत्त्व है।

विहाय शान्तिं नृप! धाम तत्पुनः
प्रसीद सन्धेहि वधाय विद्विषाम्।
व्रजन्ति शत्रूनवधूय निःस्पृहाः
शमेन सिद्धिं मुनयो न भूभृतः।।[1]

इस पद्य में महाकवि को "शत्रुओं के वध के लिए युधिष्ठिर को तेज धारण करना अभीप्सित है।" इसी विनिश्चितार्थ के प्रतिपादन के लिए

१. तदेव १/४२

भारवि ने युधिष्ठिर के प्रति द्रौपदी के मुख से अनेक कटुवचन कहलवाये। ये कटुवचन अत्यन्त तार्किक, मनोवैज्ञानिक, सामान्यजनसंवेद्य, स्वाभिमानियों के लिए संवेगोत्पादक और नीतिपरक होते हुए लगभग अट्ठारह श्लोकों तक प्रवाहित होते हैं। विनिश्चितार्थ प्रतिपादन में कोई भी बाह्य एवम् आभ्यन्तर हेतु नहीं बचता जिसके अभाव में अर्थ की गम्भीरता में कहीं से बाधा पड़ने की आशङ्का भी प्रतीत होती हो। इस प्रकार के अनेक ऐसे प्रसङ्ग इस महाकाव्य में आते हैं जहाँ स्थूणनिखननन्याय से प्रतिपाद्य अर्थ की सिद्धि करते हुए अर्थगौरव के प्रतिपादनार्थ महाकवि भारवि की लेखनी का अप्रतिम कौशल दर्शनीय है।

'भारवेरर्थगौरवम्' रूप काव्यवैभव का उपर्युक्त विवेचन निःसन्देह काव्यजगत् का एक महत्त्वपूर्ण केन्द्र बिन्दु है। महाकवियों की चर्चा के समय भारवि के सम्बन्ध में यह विचार अपरिहार्य है, क्योंकि 'भारवेरर्थगौरवम्' महाकवि भारवि के विषय में एक स्थापित प्रशस्ति है, जो परवर्ती अनेक कवियों, इतिहासकारों और साहित्यविवेचकों के द्वारा अवधार्य और प्रशंसनीय है, भारवि की कीर्ति को दिग्दिगन्त में व्याप्त करने में पूर्ण समर्थ है। 'भारवेरर्थगौरवम्' सम्बन्धी कुछ ऐसे भी निबन्ध देखने में आये हैं, जिनमें 'भारवेरर्थगौरवम्' का न केवल खण्डन किया गया है अपितु अनेक प्रकार के दोषों को उद्भावित करके इसके विपक्ष में विविध तर्क भी देने का प्रयत्न किया गया है, जो निश्चित रूप से अत्यन्त हास्यास्पद है। जिस अर्थगौरव की चर्चा संस्कृत साहित्य के इतिहास में महाकवियों कि वैदुष्य के प्रसङ्गान्तर्गत मुक्त कण्ठ से समालोचकों के द्वारा की जाती रही है और सरस्वती के अनेक वरदपुत्रों के द्वारा नतमस्तक होकर जिसमें श्रद्धा और समादर का प्रदर्शन किया जाता रहा है। स्वयं महाकवि भारवि की लेखनी के द्वारा जिस अर्थगौरव की प्रतिष्ठा का भूयो-भूयः उद्घोष किया गया है, सहसा कुछ भ्रामक तर्काभासों के आधार पर उसे निरस्त कर देना सर्वथा न केवल तथ्य से दूर होगी अपितु ऐसे निबन्धकारों की साहित्य-समालोचना भी हास्यास्पद हो उठती है, जो निश्चय ही स्वीकार करने योग्य नहीं है।

❑ ❑ ❑

संस्कृत वाङ्मय में वृत्ति-विमर्श

डॉ. अनिल कुमार सिन्हा

प्राध्यापक, संस्कृत-विभाग

डी.ए.वी. कालेज, कानपुर

भारतीय वाङ्मय में 'वृत्ति-विचार' चिन्तकों का अत्यन्त प्रिय विषय रहा है। वेद, दर्शन, व्याकरण, काव्य शास्त्र एवं लोक के विभिन्न सन्दर्भों में विभिन्न-भिन्न अर्थों में इसकी सत्ता स्वीकार की गयी है। वृत्ति शब्द 'वृतु वर्तने (भवा आ. से.) धातु से "स्त्रियाँ क्तिन्"[१] प्रत्यय करने पर निष्पन्न होता है। हलायुधकोश में भी वृत्ति की व्युत्पत्ति के सम्बन्ध में उक्त प्रकार का ही मत दृष्टिगोचर होता है।[2] अमरकोष की रामाश्रमी टीका में इसकी व्युत्पत्ति इस प्रकार दी गयी है–

१. वर्तते उनया क्तिन् (३/३/६४) "वृत्तिर्विवरणाजीवकैशिक्यादि–प्रवर्तने" इति मेदिनी[3]

इस शब्द का सर्व प्रथम प्रयोग अथर्ववेद की पैप्पलाद संहिता में "क्रिया" अथवा "व्यवहार" के अर्थ में हुआ है।[4] यास्काचार्य ने अपने ग्रन्थ निरूक्त में विस्तार से वृत्ति का निरूपण किया है। वृत्ति को ही परवर्ती आलङ्कारिकों (साहित्यशास्त्रियों) ने इसे शब्दार्थ रूप में स्वीकार किया।

---

१. सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, ३/३/६४

२. स्त्री (वृत् + क्तिन्)

– हलायुधकोश, पृ. ६३२

३. अमरकोष, रा. टी.

४. "संपृक्तस् ते वक्षणास् गर्भ पुंसा पुमान् कृतः।
सर्वांगस् तान्वो जायताम् अग्निवारुण्योरर्वृत्तिभिः।।

–अथर्ववेदपैप्पलाद संहिता ११–१–३

वृत्ति शब्द की व्याख्या में निरुक्त–व्याख्याकार स्कन्द और महेश्वर लिखते हैं कि शब्द का यह जो सामान्य कार्य होता है, वही प्रवृत्तिरूप से प्रचलित है और इसलिए जहाँ शब्द का शब्दत्व (शब्द का धर्म) होता है, वही वृत्ति कही जाती है।[1] दुर्गाचार्य वृत्ति शब्द का प्रयोग पहले अर्थरूप में करते हैं और बाद में वृत्तिसामान्य से गुण, क्रिया, सामान्य अर्थ का अवधारण करते हैं। यहाँ भी गुण, क्रिया सामान्य से अभिप्राय अर्थप्रक्रिया ही ग्रहण किया जाता है और इस प्रकार वृत्ति शब्द का अर्थ प्रवृत्ति ही होता है, जिसके प्रभाव से शब्दों का संकेत में अवधारण होता है और परस्पर उनके अर्थ प्रचलित होते हैं।[2] दुर्गाचार्य बाद में भी कहते हैं कि जो अर्थ नाना प्रकार से शब्दों में रहता है, वही (उसी को) प्रवृत्ति कहा जाता है।[3]

सांख्य में वृत्ति

सांख्य में महदादिकों एवं इन्द्रियों के व्यापार को ही वृत्ति कहा गया है। ''वृत्ति'' शब्द का प्रयोग सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी में यद्यपि अनेक स्थलों पर हुआ है, किन्तु सर्वत्र वह ''व्यापार या क्रिया'' अर्थ में ही प्रयुक्त हुआ है यथा–

प्राप्यप्रीतिविषादात्मकाः प्रकाशप्रवृत्तिनियमार्थाः।
अन्योऽन्याभिभवाश्रयजननमिथुनवृत्तयश्च गुणाः।।[4]

प्रकृत कारिका में प्रयुक्त ''वृत्ति'' शब्द क्रिया (व्यापार) का ही प्रत्यायक है। इसी तरह तेरहवी कारिका में भी ''वृत्ति'' शब्द कार्य या व्यापार अर्थ में ही प्रयुक्त है।[5] आगे एक स्थल पर रूपादि (रस, गन्ध, स्पर्श

---

१. ''यत्सामान्यं तेन तत्र प्रवृत्तिः इतिप्रतीयात्।
वर्तते तत्र शब्द इति वृत्तिरर्थ उच्यते।''
—स्कन्द, निरुक्तम्, १/१

२. शब्दवृत्तयः। पृ. १६

३. ''नानाभावेनार्थेष्ववस्थितिः प्रवृत्तिः''
—दुर्गाचार्य, निरुक्तम् २/१

४. सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी, पृ. १७३

५. ''सत्त्वं लघुप्रकाशकमिष्टमुपष्टम्भकं चलं च रजः।
गुरुवरणकमेव तमः प्रदीपवाच्चार्थतो वृत्तिः।। १३।।
—तदेव, पृ. १८४

एवं शब्द) पाँचों विषयों के आलोचन (अर्थात् अविविक्त या अस्पष्ट प्रत्यक्ष ज्ञान) को पञ्च ज्ञानेन्द्रियों की वृत्ति (व्यापार) कहा गया है। वचन, आदान, विहरण, उत्सर्ग तथा आनन्द (रमण) पाँच कर्मेन्द्रियों की ही वृत्तियाँ हैं।[१]

योग में वृत्ति

योगदर्शन में भी "वृत्ति" शब्द का प्रयोग कई स्थलों पर दृष्टिगोचर होता है। सांख्य में जिस प्रकार प्रकृति का सृष्ट्यात्मक परिणाम स्वीकृत है, उसी प्रकार योग में चित्त का वृत्यात्मक परिणाम। वृत्तियाँ चित्त के ज्ञान की भिन्न–भिन्न अवस्थाएँ हैं, अर्थात् वृत्तियाँ चित्त के ज्ञानात्मक परिणाम हैं। प्रमा तथा अप्रमा भेद से ज्ञान दो प्रकार का है और वृत्तियाँ पाँच प्रकार की हैं।[२] १– प्रमाण (सत्य ज्ञान), २– विपर्यय (मिथ्या ज्ञान) ३– विकल्प (कल्पना), ४– निद्रा (नींद) और ५– स्मृति (स्मरण)। यद्यपि विषय–सापेक्ष चित्तवृत्तियाँ विषयों के आनन्त्य से असंख्य प्रकार की हैं, तथापि योगसूत्र के निर्माता महर्षि पतञ्जलि ने उपर्युक्त पाँच वृत्तियों में ही अन्य सभी वृत्तियों का अन्तर्भाव किया है।[३]

एक अन्य स्थल पर "योग" के स्वरूप को प्रतिपादित करते हुए महर्षि ने "वृत्ति" शब्द का प्रयोग किया है। योगश्चित्तवृत्तिनिरोध,[४] यहाँ "वृत्ति" शब्द मनःस्थिति (व्यापारमयी अवस्था) के अर्थ में प्रयुक्त हुआ है।

न्याय वैशेषिक में वृत्ति

न्याय–वैशेषिक दर्शन में प्रायः वृत्तियों के सभी रूपों पर विचार किया गया है। परन्तु गौतम ने न्याय सूत्र में विशिष्ट प्रकार की वृत्ति पर विचार किया है। उन्होंने वृत्ति शब्द का प्रयोग शब्द वृत्ति के अर्थ में किया है। उनके अनुसार शब्दार्थ सम्बन्ध संकेत के अनुसार ही प्रवृत्त होता है। वह वाच्यवाचक भाव रूप ही है क्योंकि अभिधान अभिधेय सम्बन्ध से ही

---

१. "रूपादिषु पञ्चानामालोचनमात्रमिष्यते वृत्तिः।
वचनादानविहरणोत्सर्गानन्दाश्च पञ्चानाम्।। २८।।
—तदेव, पृ. २४७

२. प्रमाणाविपर्ययविकल्पनिद्रास्मृतयः
—योगसूत्र १/६, पृ. २६

३. "सर्वेषामेव................वृत्तयः पञ्चतय्य एव, नाधिका"
—त. वै., पृ. २४

४. योगसूत्र, १/२

शब्दार्थ का ज्ञान होता है। यदि ऐसा नहीं होता तो शब्द के अश्रुत होने पर भी (न सुनाई देने पर भी) ज्ञान होना चाहिए।[1] ऋषि, आर्य और म्लेच्छादि स्वेच्छा से शब्दों का प्रयोग करते हैं और उनका अर्थज्ञान प्राप्त करते हैं। यदि शब्दार्थ सम्बन्ध स्वाभाविक होता तो यथेच्छ व्यवहार न होता।[2] प्रकारान्तर से शब्द का अर्थ में संकेत ही इनके अनुसार वृत्ति है।

नव्यन्यायकार जगदीश का "वृत्ति" के विषय में विचार है कि सभी शब्द साकांक्ष होते हैं। वे अपनी–अपनी वृत्ति से ही पदार्थों को प्रकाशित या उपस्थापित करते हैं। इसीलिए वृत्ति का फलितार्थ हुआ कि सभी प्रयोक्ता–जन शास्त्र की प्रवृत्ति के द्वारा शब्दों के व्यवहार को जैसा चाहते हैं, वैसा प्रयोग करते हैं। ऐसी यह वृत्ति आचार्य जगदीश के मत में दो प्रकार की है– शक्ति और लक्षणा।[3]

वेदान्त में वृत्ति

वेदान्त में "वृत्ति" शब्द का प्रयोग "व्यापार" अर्थ में हुआ है। वेदान्तसार में बुद्धि, मन एवं चित्त के विवेचन के अवसर पर इसका प्रयोग किया गया है। इसके अनुसार अन्तःकरण की निश्चयात्मिका वृत्ति बुद्धि, संकल्पविकल्यात्मिका वृत्ति मन एवं अनुसन्धानकर्त्री वृत्ति ही चित्त है।[4] उक्त प्रयोग को देखते हुए यह स्पष्ट है कि यहाँ "वृत्ति" शब्द "व्यापार"

---

१. क) "सामयिकत्वाच्छब्दार्थसम्प्रत्ययस्य"

—न्यायसूत्र, २/१/५५

ख) "कश्चायं समयः ? अस्य शब्दस्येदमर्थजातमभिधेयम् इत्यभिधानाभिधेययोगः। तस्मिन्नुपयुक्ते शब्दार्थसम्प्रत्ययो भवति।"

—न्यायसूत्र पर वात्स्यायनभाष्य, २/१/५५

२. क) "जातिविशेषे वाङ्नियमात्"

—न्यायसूत्र, २/१/५६

ख) "सामयिकः शब्दार्थसम्प्रत्ययो न स्वाभाविकः – ऋष्यार्थम्लेच्छानां यथाकामं शब्दप्रयोगोऽर्थप्रत्यायनाय भवति। स्वाभाविके हि शब्दस्यार्थप्रत्यायकत्वे यथाकामं न स्यात।

—तदेव, २/१/५६

३. "पदार्थोपस्थितिर्व्यापारः वृत्तिश्च शक्तिलक्षणाभेदाद्द्विधा"।

— शब्दशक्तिप्रकाशिका, पृ. २४१

४. "बुद्धिर्नाम निश्चयात्मिकान्तः करणवृत्तिः, मनो नाम सङ्कल्पविकल्पात्मिकान्तः करणवृत्तिः, अनुसन्धानात्मिकान्तः करणवृत्तिः चित्तम्"।।

— वेदान्तसार, पृ. १६६–६७

अर्थ में ही प्रयुक्त हुआ है।

वेदान्तदर्शन के अनुसार अन्तःकरण इन्द्रिय के द्वारा बाहर आकर कर्म (विषय) रूप में परिणत होता है और चेतन अन्तःकरण बाह्य पदार्थ का रूप धारण करता है। वेदान्तपरिभाषा में अन्तःकरण के इस परिणाम को वृत्ति कहा गया है।

जिस प्रकार तालाब का जल बिलों के द्वारा केदारों में प्रवेश कर केदार के सदृश रूप को धारण कर लेता है, उसी प्रकार तेजस् अन्तःकरण भी चक्षु आदि इन्द्रिय के द्वारा घटादि में प्रवेश कर घट आदि के आकार का ही हो जाता है। तात्पर्य यह है कि चेतन अन्तःकरण का विषयाकार परिणाम ही वृत्ति है।[1]

व्याकरणशास्त्र में वृत्ति

व्याकरणशास्त्र में "वृत्ति" शब्द की अनेक व्याख्याएँ उपलब्ध होती हैं। कातन्त्र व्याकरण में सूत्रों की स्पष्ट एवं संक्षिप्त व्याख्या को वृत्ति कहते हैं।[2] लघुसिद्धान्तकौमुदी में कृत्, तद्धित, समास, एकशेष और सनाद्यन्त धातुओं को पंच वृत्तियों से अभिहित किया गया है।[3] महाभाष्य में परार्थ के अभिधान को वृत्ति कहा गया है।[4] प्रत्यय या अन्य पद के अर्थ को साथ लेकर जो विशिष्ट अर्थ प्रतीत होता है, उसे पदार्थ कहते हैं। वृत्ति से उसी पदार्थ का बोध होता है। नागेशभट्कृत "परमलघुमञ्जूषा" के "समासादिवृत्त्यर्थनिरूपण" प्रकरण में दो प्रकार की वृत्तियाँ बताई गई हैं– प्रथमा जहत्स्वार्था एवं द्वितीया अजहत्स्वार्था वृत्ति। जिस वृत्ति में पद अपना अर्थ छोड़ देते हैं, वह जहत्स्वार्थावृत्ति है। जिस वृत्ति में पद अपना अर्थ नहीं

---

१. "तत्र यथा तटाकोदकं छिद्रामिर्गत्य कुत्यात्मना केदारान् प्रविश्य तद्वदेव चतुष्कोणाद्याकारं भवति तथा तैजसमन्तःकरणमपि चक्षुरादिद्वारा निर्गत्य घटादिविषयदेशं गत्वा घटादिविषयाकारेण परिणतमिति स एष परिणामो वृत्तिरित्युच्यते'।

–वेदान्त परिभाषा, पृ. १३

२. "सूत्रस्यार्थविवरण वृत्तिः"

– कातन्त्र व्याकरण, पृ. ५०

३. "कृत्तद्धित–समासैवशेषसनाऽऽद्यन्तधातुरूपाः पञ्च वृत्तयः"

– लघुसिद्धान्तकौमुदी, पृ. ८२०

४. "परार्थाऽभिधानं वृत्ति"

– महाभाष्य २/१/१

छोड़ते हैं, वह "अजहत्स्वार्थावृत्ति है। इसलिए जहत्स्वार्था का लक्षण किया है– "अवयवार्थनिरपेक्षत्वे सति समुदायार्थबोधिकात्वम जहत्स्वार्थात्वम" अर्थात् जिस वृत्ति में अवयवों के अर्थ की अपेक्षा न कर केवल समुदायार्थ बोध हो, वह जहत्स्वार्थावृत्ति है। जैसे– "रथन्तरं सामवेदः" शुश्रुषा सेवा" यहाँ अवयवों का अर्थ कुछ नहीं होता केवल समुदाय का अर्थ साम और सेवा होता है। अजहत्त्वार्था का लक्षण यह है– "अवयवार्थसंवलितसमुदायार्थ–बोधिकात्वमजहत्स्वार्थात्वम्" अर्थात् अवयवों के अर्थ के साथ–साथ समुदाय का अर्थ जिस वृत्ति में हो, वह अजहत्स्वार्थावृत्ति है। जैसे– "राजपुरुषः"। यहाँ अवयव का भी अर्थ राजा का पुरुष होता है और समुदाय का भी अर्थ राजसम्बन्धी पुरुष होता है।[1]

वाक्यपदीय एवं शब्दकौस्तुभ में भी "वृत्ति" का उल्लेख "व्यापार" (क्रिया) अर्थ में हुआ है। इन ग्रन्थों में द्रुता, मध्यमा और निलम्बिता ये तीन वृत्ति वृत्तियाँ प्रतिपादित की गयी हैं। शब्द– कौस्तुभ में वृत्तियों का उद्देश्य निम्नलिखित रूप में उद्धृत हैं–

"अभ्यासार्थे द्रुता वृत्तिः प्रयोगार्थे तु मध्यमा।
शिष्याणां तूपदेशार्थं वृत्तिरिष्टा विलम्बिता।।"[2]

वृत्ति शब्द, व्याकरण शास्त्र में जटिल रचना जिसकी व्याख्या करने की आवश्यकता पड़े, इस अर्थ में भी लिया जाता है। सूत्र ग्रन्थों की रचना करने में अत्यन्त लाघव से काम लिया जाता है। सूत्र, तन्तु के अवयवों के समान, अर्थों अथवा अर्थों को अपने में गुम्फित किये रहते हैं। इस प्रकार सूत्र उन अर्थों की सूचना देने वाले संकेतमात्र होते हैं। उन सूत्रों का अभिज्ञान हृदयंगम करने या कराने के लिए व्याख्यान की आवश्यकता होती है। इस प्रकार के लघु व्याख्या का "वृत्ति" शब्द से व्यवहार होता है।

वृत्ति शब्द का प्रयोग भाष्य, टीका, विवृत्ति आदि अर्थ में भी किया जाता है।[3] यथा – काशिकावृत्तिः आदि।

---

१. परमलघुमञ्जूषा, पृ. २२८

२. शब्दकौस्तुभ, १/१/७०

३. वा.शि.आ., पृ. ६७१

इस स्थल पर यह प्रश्न उत्पन्न हो सकता है कि वृत्ति और भाष्य में क्या अन्तर है ? इसके प्रत्युत्तर में यह कहा जा सकता है कि वृत्ति में पदच्छेद, पदार्थ, समास–विग्रह, अनुवृत्ति, वाक्य, योजना (अर्थात् अर्थ), उदाहरण, प्रत्युदाहरण, पूर्वपक्ष और समाधान ये अंश प्रायः रहा करते हैं। वृत्तिकार यह विवरण सूत्र के शब्दों से बँधा हुआ अपनी समझ में आये अभिप्राय या सार के अनुसार संक्षेप में देता है, जबकि भाष्यकर्ता अपना अभिप्राय और मूल ग्रन्थकार का अभिप्राय विस्तार के साथ तो देता ही है, अन्य विद्वानों द्वारा व्यक्त किये गये "अभिप्राय" का भी अनुशीलन करता है। इस प्रकार वृत्तिका आधार जहाँ संकुचित अथवा सीमित होता है, वहाँ भाष्य का आधार व्यापक एवं विस्तृत होता है।

संक्षेप में कहा जा सकता है कि "वृत्ति" सूत्रों का लघु व्याख्यान रूप है और भाष्य बृहद् व्याख्यान रूप।

नाट्यशास्त्र में चार प्रकार की वृत्तियाँ मानी गयी हैं– भारती, सात्वती, आरभटी तथा कैशिकी। यहाँ "वृत्ति" का अर्थ है "व्यवहार" अथवा "व्यापार"। नाट्य में नायक आदि के व्यापार को ही वृत्ति कहा जाता है।[1] भरत इन्हें "काव्यमातृका" कहते हैं।[2] व्यापार तीन प्रकार के होते हैं– वाचिक, कायिक और मानसिक। वचो व्यापाररूपा वृत्ति भारती वृत्ति है। मनोव्यापाररूपा सात्वती वृत्ति है तथा कायिकव्यापाररूपा आरभटी वृत्ति है।[3] इन तीनों व्यापारों में सौन्दर्य का आधान करने वाली वृत्ति की कैशिकी वृत्ति कहलाती है। साथ ही साथ यह भी बताया गया है कि भारती वृत्ति – करुण और अद्भुत में, सात्वतीवृत्ति– वीर, रौद्र और अद्भुत में, आरभटी वृत्ति– भयानक, वीभत्स और रौद्र में तथा कैशिकी वृत्ति श्रृंगार और हास्य में होती है। ये वृत्तियाँ नाट्यवृत्ति के नाम से भी प्रसिद्ध हैं। इन्हें

---

१. तद् (नायकस्य) व्यापारात्मिका वृत्तिश्चतुर्धा (दशरूपकम् २/४७
चतस्रो वृत्तयो ह्येताः सर्वनाट्यस्य मातृकाः।
स्युर्नायकादिव्यापार–विशेषा नाटकादिषु।
–साहित्यदर्पण, ६/१२३

२. "सर्वेषामेव काव्यानां मातृका वृत्तयः स्मृताः"
–नाट्यशास्त्र १०/४

३. "भारती वाग्वृत्तिः, मनोव्यापाररूपा सात्विकी सात्वती,– आरभटी कायवृत्तिः"।
–अ.भा., वाल्यूम २, पृ. २०

नाट्य की भी जननी कहा गया है।[1]

ध्वनिकार आगे उल्लिखित उपनागरिकादि वृत्तियों को शब्द वृत्ति तथा कैशिकी आदि वृत्तियों को अर्थवृत्ति कहते हैं और उनका रसध्वनि में ही पर्यवसान मानते हैं, क्योंकि सारी वृत्तियाँ रसानुगुणता के कारण ही नाट्य एवं काव्य में शोभा उत्पन्न करती हैं।

शब्दकोष[2] में भी "वृत्ति" शब्द के अनेक अर्थ प्राप्त होते हैं– यथा– १– अस्तित्व या सत्ता, २– टिकना, रहना, रुख, किसी विशेष स्थिति में होना जैसे कि विरुद्धवृत्ति या विपक्षवृत्ति में, ३– अवस्था, दशा ४– कार्य, गति। रघुवंश में कविकुलगुरु महाकवि कालिदास ने कार्य अर्थ में ही वृत्ति शब्द का प्रयोग किया है– "शतेस्तमक्ष्णामनिमेषवृत्तिभिः।[3] अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तल में भी "वृत्ति शब्द उक्त (कार्य या शक्ति) अर्थ में ही प्रयुक्त हुआ है।[4] ५– क्रम, प्रणाली, ६– आचरण, व्यवहार, चालचलन, कार्यपद्धति। शाकुन्तल के चतुर्थ अंक में "वृत्ति" शब्द व्यवहार अर्थ में प्रयुक्त हुआ है।[5] ७– पेशा, व्यवसाय, जीवनचर्या। रघुवंश में यह व्यवसाय अर्थ में प्रयुक्त हुआ है।[6]

लौकिक जगत् में "वृत्ति" का प्रयोग मुख्यतः मनुष्य की सूक्ष्म वृत्तियों या मानसिक वृत्तियों एवं जीविका इत्यादि के लिए होता है। "वृत्ति" का ही व्यक्त रूप प्रवृत्ति है। प्रवृत्ति का प्रयोग कार्य– विशेष में अनुरक्ति या अनुरक्त होने की संभावना के लिए होता है। जैसी मनुष्य की मानसिक वृत्तियाँ होंगी, वैसे ही क्रिया-कलापों में वह अनुरक्त होगा। वृत्ति

---

१. "वृत्तयो नाट्यमातरः" (नाट्यदर्पण)

२. वामन शिवराम आप्टे, पृ. ६७१, अमरकोष, पृ. ४४१, हलायुधकोश, पृ. ६३२

३. क) "उत्पक्ष्मणोर्नयनयोरूपरूद्धवृत्ति"
—अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तल, ४/१५

ख) "ओत्सुक्यमात्रमवसाययति प्रतिष्ठा, क्लिश्नातिलब्धपरिपालनवृत्तिरेनम्"
तदेव, ५/६

४. तदेव, २/११

५. "कुरू प्रियसरवीवृत्तिं सपत्नीजने"
तदेव, ४/१८

६. "वार्धके मुनिवृत्तीनाम्"
—रघुवंश, १/८

सूक्ष्म है, अंतरंग है, जबकि प्रवृत्ति स्थूल एवं बाह्य है। किसी व्यक्ति की वर्तमान वृत्तियों से भावी प्रवृत्तियों का पता लगा सकते हैं तो दूसरी और उसकी प्रवृत्तियों को देखकर उसकी मूलवृत्तियों को समझ सकते हैं। इस प्रकार वृत्ति और प्रवृत्ति में कारण–कार्य संबंध है।

काव्यशास्त्र में वृत्ति

संस्कृत काव्यशास्त्र में वृत्ति शब्द का प्रयोग सर्वप्रथम भट्ट उद्‌भट ने किया था। उन्होंने "काव्यालंकारसारसंग्रह" के अनुप्रास अलंकार के प्रसंग में वृत्तियों का विवेचन किया है। वे वृत्तियों को अनुप्रास की जाति मानते हैं। उनके अनुसार वृत्तियाँ तीन प्रकार की हैं– परुषा[1], उपनागरिका[2] और ग्राम्या[3] (कोमला)। आचार्य उद्‌भट के वृत्ति–सिद्धान्त का प्रतिपादन करते हुए लोचनकार कहते हैं कि वर्णनीय विषय की दीप्तिमत्ता, मसृणता तथा मध्यमता को दृष्टि में रखकर ही वर्णों की परुषता, कोमलता तथा मध्यमता के अनुसार अनुप्रास के तीन वर्ग बनाने के लिए तीन वृत्तियाँ बनायी गयी हैं और इस प्रकार ये वृत्तियाँ केवल अनुप्रास की जातियाँ ही हैं।[4]

---

१. "शषाभ्यां रेफसंयोगे ष्टवर्गेण च योजिता।
परुषा नाम वृत्तिस्स्यात् ह्लह्वह्याद्यैश्च संयुता।।"
–काव्यलङ्कार सारसंग्रह १/४

२. "सरूपसंयोगयुतां मूर्ध्नि वर्गान्त्ययोगिभिः।
स्पर्शैर्युतां व मन्यन्ते उपनागरिकां बुधाः।।"
–तदेव १/५

३. "शेषैर्वर्णैर्यमायोगं कथितां कोमलाख्यया।
ग्राम्यां वृत्तिं प्रशंसन्ति काव्येष्वादृतबुद्धयः।।"
–तदेव १/६

४. "अनुप्रासानामेव दीप्तमसृणमध्यमवर्णनीययोपयोगितया परुषत्वललितत्व मध्यमत्व स्वरूपविवेचनाय वर्गत्रयसम्पादनार्थं तिस्रोऽनुप्रासजातयो वृत्तय इत्युक्ताः। वर्तन्तेऽनुप्रासभेदः आस्विति, यदाहुः–

सरूपव्यंजनन्यासं तिसृष्वैतासु वृत्तिषु।
पृथग्पृथगनुप्रासमुशन्ति कवयः सदा।।

पृथक्पृथीगति। परुषानुप्रासा नागरिका। मसृणानुप्रासा उपनागरिका, ललिता। नागरिकया विदग्ध्या उपमितेति कृत्वा। मध्यमकोमलपरुषमित्यर्थं। अतएव वैदग्ध्यविहीनस्वभावा सुकुमारपरुषमित्यर्थं। अतएव वैदग्यविहीनस्वभावा सुकुमारपरुषग्राम्यवनितासादृश्यादियं वृत्तिर्गाम्येति। तत्र तृतीयः कोमलानुप्रास इति वृत्तयोऽनुप्रासजातय एव।"
–ध्वन्यालोक लोचन प्रथम उद्योत पृ. ३०

अनुप्रास– जाति होने के कारण वृत्तियों का अनुप्रास अलंकार से अभ्यधिक व्यापार नहीं है। इसलिए वे अनुप्रास से भिन्न नहीं हैं। ध्वनिसिद्धान्त के अनुसार उद्भट की परुषा आदि वृत्तियों का पर्यवसान भी रसध्वनि में हो जाता है, क्योंकि वर्णों की परुषता तथा कोमलता का रस व्यञ्जकता के कारण ही महत्त्व सिद्ध होता है, इसलिए कठोर वर्णों वाली परुषा वृत्ति का रौद्रादि में, उप–नागरिका वृत्ति का शृंगारादि कोमल रसों में तथा ग्राम्या (कोमल) वृत्ति का हास्यादि रसों में ही पर्यवसान हो जाता है।[1]

आचार्य रुद्रट ने दो प्रकार की वृत्ति मानी है– वर्ण वृत्ति तथा पद वृत्ति। यद्यपि उन्होंने इस प्रकार से द्विविध वृत्ति का नामकरण नहीं किया तथापि उनके वृत्ति–विवेचन से यही निष्कर्ष निकलता है। पदवृत्ति न कहकर "नाम्नां वृत्तिः" कहते हैं और नामाख्यातनिपातादि में परिगणित नाम शब्द का अर्थपद ही है। वर्ण वृत्ति ही अनुप्रास वृत्ति है। यह अनुप्रास वृत्ति पाँच प्रकार की मानी गयी है– मधुरा, प्रौढ़ा, परुषा, ललिता तथा भद्रा।[2] यह तो वर्णों के सन्निवेश के आधार पर अनुप्रास वृत्ति है। क्योंकि अनुप्रास में वर्णों का ही साम्य रहता है, पद का नहीं। पदों के सन्निवेश के आधार पर मानी गयी पदवृत्ति (नामवृत्ति) के दो भेद करते हैं– समासवती वृत्ति तथा असमासवती वृत्ति।

आचार्य आनन्द वर्धनकृत ध्वन्यालोक में वृत्ति शब्द का प्रयोग कई अर्थों में दृष्टिगत होता है। ध्वन्यालोक के प्रथम उद्योत में ध्वनिकार ने "वर्ण–संघटना" को ही "वृत्ति" बताया है।[3] द्वितीय उद्योत में भी एक स्थल पर इस शब्द का प्रयोग हुआ है। वहाँ यह व्यापार अथवा व्यवहार

---

१. लोचन, पृ. ५१८

२. "मधुरा प्रौढ़ा परुषा ललिता भद्रेति वृत्तयः पञ्च।
वर्णानां नानात्वादस्येति यथार्थनामफलाः।।"
—का. लं., २/१६

३. "वर्णसंघटनाधर्माश्च ये माधुर्यादयस्तेऽपि प्रतीयन्ते तदनतिरिक्तवृत्तयोऽपि याः कैश्चिदुपनागरिकाद्याः प्रकाशिताः, ता अपि गताः श्रवणगोचरम्, रीतयश्च वैदर्भीप्रभृतयः।"
—ध्वन्यालोक १/१, पृ. २६

को ही वृत्ति मानते हैं[1] और रसादि के अनुकूल शब्द के उचित व्यवहार को शब्द वृत्ति कहते हैं। लोचनकार अभिनवगुप्त ने भी व्यापार अर्थ में ही वृत्ति शब्द का प्रयोग किया है।[2]

आचार्य मम्मट ने काव्यप्रकाश के नवम उल्लास में वृत्यनुप्रास के प्रसंग में "वृत्ति" शब्द का उल्लेख किया है। यहाँ "वृत्ति" शब्द का अर्थ "नियत वर्णों में रहने वाला रस–विषयक व्यापार है।[3] प्रकारान्तर से मधुर आदि रसों के लिए जो कोमल वर्ण आदि के प्रयोग का नियम है, उन वर्णों का रस व्यंजना के अनुकूल व्यापार अर्थात् विशेष अनुपूर्वी से वर्ण–संघटना ही वृत्ति है और वृत्ति पर आश्रित अनुप्रास ही वृत्यनुप्रास है।

प्राचीन आचार्य उद्भट ने काव्य की जिन तीन वृत्तियों (उपनागरिका, परुषा तथा कोमला) का उल्लेख किया था, उन्हीं को आचार्य वामन ने वैदर्भी आदि रीति के नाम से विवेचित किया है।[4] दण्डी और कुन्तक ने मार्ग नाम से तथा आनन्दवर्धन ने संघटना नाम से इसका उल्लेख किया था। आचार्य मम्मट ने १– तीन गुणों (माधुर्य, ओजस् और प्रसाद) के अनुसार तीन प्रकार की गुणाभिव्यञ्जक वृत्तियों को ही स्वीकार किया है।[4] २– "वृत्ति" "रीति" को अभिन्न माना है तथा ३– उनका स्वतन्त्र अस्तित्व न मानकर वृत्यनुप्रास में ही अन्तर्भाव कर दिया है।

उपर्युक्त सम्पूर्ण विवेचन को देखते हुए यह स्पष्ट है कि प्रायः सभी मतों में "वृत्ति" शब्द "व्यापार" का वाचक रहा है। अतएव अर्थ के प्रत्यायन में होने वाले शब्द के व्यापार को भी आचार्यों ने वृत्ति नाम से

---

१. "व्यवहारो हि वृतितरित्युच्यते। वाचका त्रयाश्चोपनागरिकाद्याः वृत्तयो"
—ध्वन्यालोक, २/३३ की वृत्ति

२. "वृत्तिशब्दस्य व्यापारवाचितोऽभिप्रायः"
—ध्वन्यालोक, लोचन प्र.उ.पृ. ३२

३. "वृत्तिर्नियतवर्णगतो रसविषयो व्यापारः"
—काव्यप्रकाश उद्योत ६, वृत्तिभाग, पृ. ४३५

४. "एतास्तिस्रो वृत्तयः वामनादीनां मते वैदर्भीगौडीपाञ्चात्याख्या रीतयो मताः"
—तदेव, वृत्ति भाग, पृ. ४३७

५. "माधुर्यण्यञ्जकैर्वर्णेरुपनागरिकोच्यते" (१०८)
"ओजः प्रकाशकैस्तैस्तु परुषा" (१०६)
"कोमला परैः" (११०)
—तदेव, पृ. ४३६

अभिहित किया है। वेद, व्याकरण, दर्शन, नाट्य-शास्त्र एवं काव्य शास्त्र आदि में भी शब्द वृत्तियों पर पर्याप्त विचार किया गया है। प्रायः अभिधा, लक्षणा नामक वृत्तियों को सभी ने स्वीकार किया है। मीमांसक तात्पर्यवृत्ति को भी मानते हैं। कुछ वैयाकरणों यथा नागेश भट्ट एवं काव्यशास्त्रियों ने विस्तारपूर्वक व्यञ्जना वृत्ति का भी निरूपण किया है। साहित्य के क्षेत्र में भामह, दण्डी, भट्टोद्भट तथा वामन आदि ने भी शब्द वृत्तियों पर कुछ विचार किया था किन्तु वे प्रायः अभिधा तथा लक्षणा पर ही विचार करते रहे। आगे चलकर ध्वनि के उद्भव के साथ व्यञ्जना वृत्ति का विवेचन साहित्य शास्त्र में होने लगा। आनन्दवर्धन और अभिनव गुप्त ने इसका विस्तृत विवेचन किया है। काव्य प्रकाशकार आचार्य मम्मट ने सभी मतों का सार संग्रह करते हुए साहित्य के क्षेत्र में शब्द की तीन वृत्तियाँ (व्यापार) स्वीकार की हैं।[१] शब्दव्यापारविचार नामक ग्रन्थ में भी इन्होंने अभिधादि को वृत्ति पद से ही व्यवहृत किया है।[२]

मम्मट के पूर्ववर्ती आचार्य ध्वन्यालोककार आचार्य आनन्दवर्धन ने भी अभिधा, लक्षणा एवं व्यञ्जना आदि के लिए "वृत्ति" शब्द का ही प्रयोग किया[३] है टीकाकार अभिनवगुप्त वृत्ति के पर्याय के रूप में व्यापार शब्द का प्रयोग करते हैं।[४] भोजकृत सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरण में लक्षणा के भेदों के लिए

---

१. "स्याद्वाचको लाक्षणिकः शब्दोऽत्र व्यञ्जकस्त्रिधा"।। काव्यप्रकाश २/५
क) स मुख्योऽर्थस्तत्र मुख्यो व्यापारोऽस्याभिधोच्यते।। तदेव २/८
ख) मुख्यार्थबाधे तद्योगे रूढ़ितोऽथ प्रयोजनात्।
अन्योऽर्थो लक्ष्यते यत् सा लक्षणारोपिता क्रिया।। तदेव २/६
ग) "तत्र व्यापारो व्यञ्जनात्मकः"
—तदेव, द्वितीय उल्लास, पृ. ३३, ५३, ५४, ८१

२. "इह हेयोपादेयानां हानोपादाने प्रमाणादेव, तच्च निश्चयात्मतया प्रामाण्यं भजते। निश्चयश्च शब्दसाहित्येनार्थं विषयी करोति। शब्दस्य चार्थ प्रतीतिप्रतिपत्तिलक्षण–कार्यान्यथानुपपत्या कारकत्वात् कल्पमानो व्यापारोऽभिधादिशब्दप्रतिपाद्यो नानाप्रकार इति तत्परीक्षार्थं शब्दव्यापारविचारात्मकं प्रकरणमिदमारभ्यते।"
—शब्दव्यापारविचार, पृ. १

३. "मुख्यां वृत्तिं परित्यज्य गुणवृत्याऽर्थदर्शनम्।
यदुदिदश्य फलं तत्र शब्दो नैव स्खलद्गतिः।। १७।।
—ध्वन्यालोक १/१७, पृ. १५७

४. "कात्र वृत्तिः, अजहत्स्वार्था पुनर्यदजहत्स्वार्था परार्थाभिधानरूपवृत्तिः स्यात्।"
—सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरण, पृ. २६६

वृत्ति शब्द का प्रयोग पाया जाता है।[1] आचार्य हेमचन्द्र ने माधुर्यव्यञ्जक, ओजोव्यञ्जक एवं प्रसादव्यञ्जक वर्णों को ही क्रमशः उपनागरिका, परुषा एवं कोमला वृत्ति माना है।[2] इन्होंने अभिधादि के लिए वृत्ति शब्द का प्रयोग नहीं किया, अपितु इनको शब्द के चतुर्विधि प्रकार के रूप में परिगणित किया है।[3] चन्द्रालोककार जयदेव ने भी अभिधा आदि को वृत्ति शब्द से व्यवहृत किया है।[4] उनके अनुसार जिस प्रकार तीन (गम्भीर, कुटिल और सरल) प्रवाहों से युक्त होकर गंगा सुशोभित होती है, उसी प्रकार वृत्ति के तीन भेदों से युक्त होकर वाणी कहीं गम्भीर, कहीं कुटिल और कहीं सरल होती हुई सुशोभित होती है। वाणी के विशेषण के रूप में जो गम्भीर, कुटिल और सरल पद आये हैं, उनका अर्थ क्रमशः अर्थ–बोधक, लक्ष्यार्थ–बोधक और वाच्यार्थ–बोधक है। मंखक व शारदातनय जैसे आचार्यों ने पदार्थ के प्रतिपादन में होने वाले व्यापार को वृत्ति माना तथा उसको मुख्या, लक्षणा तथा गौणी नाम से विभाजित किया।[5] साहित्य दर्पणकार आचार्य विश्वनाथ ने वृत्ति के स्थान पर शक्ति शब्द का प्रयोग तथा इस शक्ति शब्द से अभिधा, लक्षणा तथा व्यञ्जना तीनों को गृहीत किया।[6] केशव मिश्र के अनुसार पदों की तीन प्रकार की वृत्तियाँ होती हैं– शक्ति, लक्षणा एवं

---

१. "कात्र वृत्तिः, अजहत्स्वार्था पुनर्यदजहत्स्वार्था पदार्थाभिधानरूपा वृत्तिः स्यात्।"
–तदेव, पृ. २६६

२. "माधुर्यौजः प्रसादव्यञ्जकाश्च वर्णा उपनागरिका परुषा कोमला च वृत्तिरित्याचक्षते।।"
–काव्यानुशासन, पृ. २६२

३. "मुख्यगौणलक्ष्यव्यङ्ग्यार्थभेदात् मुख्यगौणलक्षकव्यञ्जकाः शब्दाः।।"
–तदेव, पृ. ४२

४. "वृत्तिभेदैस्त्रिभिर्युक्ता स्रोतोभिरिव जाह्नवी।
भारती भाति गम्भीरा कुटिला सरला क्वचित्।।"
–चन्द्रालोक, ७/१, पृ. २८५

५. वृत्तिः पदानां व्यापारः पदार्थप्रतिपादने।
सा मुख्या लक्षणा गौणीत्येवं त्रैविध्यमास्थिता।।
–साहित्यमीमांसा, पृ. २

६. "वाच्यार्थोऽभिधया बोध्यो लक्ष्यो लक्षणया मतः।
व्यङ्ग्यो व्यञ्जनया ताः स्युस्तिस्रः शब्दस्य शक्तयः।।"
–साहित्यदर्पण २/३, पृ. ७०

व्यञ्जना। उन्होंने अभिधा के लिए "शक्ति" शब्द का प्रयोग किया है।[1] वृत्तिवार्तिककार अप्पय दीक्षित ने भी उक्त त्रिविध शब्दों के लिए व्यापार (वृत्ति) शब्द का प्रयोग किया है। इन्होंने ग्रन्थ के प्रारम्भ में कहा है कि तीन नेत्रों सदृश अभिधा, लक्षणा एवं ध्वनन अर्थात् व्यञ्जना व्यापार द्वारा विश्व के समस्त पदार्थों का प्रकाशन करती हुई हरमूर्तिस्वरूपा तथा विद्वानों द्वारा उपास्या सरस्वती सर्वोत्कृष्ट है।[2] आचार्य द्वारा प्रस्तुत किये गये इस मांगलिक श्लोक से यह स्पष्ट है कि यह भी शब्द के उक्त तीनों व्यापारों को स्वीकार करते हैं। त्रिवेणिका में आद्याधर भट्ट *"शिक्यते इति शक्तिः"* इस व्युत्पत्ति के अनुसार जिसके द्वारा शब्द साक्षात् संकेतित अर्थ का अभिधान करता है उसे शक्ति कहते हैं। शक्ति पद में शक् (शक्लृ) धातु से करण अर्थ में क्तिन् प्रत्यय विहित है, क्योंकि धातु अनेकार्थक होते हैं, अतः यहाँ शक् धातु का अर्थ साक्षात् अभिधान करना है।[3] उनके अनुसार वृत्ति, व्यापार तथा क्रिया पयार्यवाची शब्द हैं।[4]

इन वृत्तियों के माध्यम से तीन प्रकार के अर्थों का बोध होता है, अर्थात् उनमें प्रथम अभिधावृत्ति से प्रतीत अर्थ को शक्यार्थ, वाच्यार्थ, अभिधेयार्थ तथा मुख्यार्थ कहा जाता है। द्वितीय वृत्ति लक्षणा से प्रतीत होने वाले अर्थ को लक्ष्यार्थ लाक्षणिकार्थ, भाक्त तथा औपचारिक अर्थ कहा जाता है। इसी प्रकार तृतीय वृत्ति व्यञ्जना से प्रकट होने वाले अर्थ को व्यंग्यार्थ, प्रतीयमानार्थ तथा ध्वनितार्थ या ध्वनि रूप अर्थ कहा जाता है। काव्य सम्बन्धी तत्त्व चिन्तन में शब्द वृत्तियों का मूर्धन्य स्थान है। काव्य

---

१. "पदानां वृत्तयस्तिस्रः भवन्ति। शक्तिलक्षणाव्यञ्जना चेति"
—अलङ्कारशेखर, पृ. ६

२. "विश्वम्प्रकाशयन्ती व्यापारेर्लक्षणाभिधाध्वननैः।
जयनैरिव हरमूर्त्तिर्विबुधोपास्या सरस्वती जयति।।"
—वृत्तिवार्तिक, पृ. १

३. "शक्यते साक्षादभिधीयतेऽनयेति शक्तिः।"बाहुलकात्" करणे क्तिन प्रत्ययः। धातूनामनेकार्थत्वाच्छक्नोतेः साक्षादभिधानार्थत्वम्"
—त्रिवेणिका, पृ. २

४. "तदवशात् तिस्रो वृत्तयो भवन्ति। वृत्तिः व्यापारः क्रिया चेति पर्यायशब्दाः। तत्राद्या शक्तिरभिधा मुख्या चेत्युच्यते, द्वितीया लक्षणा, भक्तिरुपचारश्चेति व्यपदिश्यते। तृतीया व्यक्तिव्यञ्जना, द्योतना, ध्वनना प्रत्यायना चेति व्यवछियते।"
— वही, पृ. ६

शास्त्रियों के अनुसार शब्द के अर्थबोधक व्यापार को शब्द शक्ति पद से व्यवहृत किया जा सकता है। यद्यपि अद्यावधि प्राप्त मतों के अनुसार शब्दशक्ति– प्रभेदों का वर्गीकरण अभिधा, लक्षणा, व्यञ्जना, तात्पर्या, रसना, भावना, भोग आदि विविध नामों से किया जा सकता है किन्तु काव्यशास्त्र में अभिधा, लक्षणा तथा व्यञ्जना नाम से ही त्रिविध वृत्तियाँ सर्वसम्मत हैं जिनकी विस्तृत चर्चा काव्यशास्त्रीय ग्रन्थों में की गयी है।

इस प्रकार उपर्युक्त अध्ययन से सम्पूर्ण संस्कृत-वाङ्मय में उपलब्ध वृत्ति-विषयक़ विविध अवधारणाओं को प्रस्तुत करके 'वृत्ति' के विविध स्वरूपों एवं महत्त्व को प्रतिपादित किया जा सकता है क्योंकि प्रत्येक दृष्टि से वृत्ति का अपना–अपना विशिष्ट वैभव संस्कृत-वाङ्मय को समलंकृत करता है।

❑ ❑ ❑

मुद्राराक्षस की टीका-परम्परा

शुचि
शोधच्छात्रा

टीका शब्द 'टीकृ' (गतौ) धातु से निष्पन्न है। 'टीक्यते गम्यते ग्रन्थार्थोऽनया' जिसके द्वारा ग्रन्थ का मूल अर्थ स्पष्ट हो, उसे टीका कहा जाता है।[1] अभिधानचिन्तामणि कोष में आचार्य हेमचन्द्र ने टीका का अर्थ किया है– 'निरन्तर व्याख्या' जिसका तात्पर्य है कि किसी ग्रन्थ के साधारण तथा असाधारण प्रत्येक शब्दों की व्याख्या का नाम है टीका[2]। राजशेखर ने भी टीका शब्द की व्याख्या इसी अर्थ में की है–

यथासम्भवमर्थस्य टीकनं टीका।[3]

इस प्रकार टीका उसे कहा जाता है, जिसके द्वारा मूल ग्रन्थ के भाव तथा प्रतिपाद्य को भलीभाँति स्पष्ट किया जा सके।

किसी भी शास्त्र को समझने तथा काव्य के रसात्मबोध के लिए टीकाओं का विशेष योगदान होता है। टीका सेतु के समान होती है, क्योंकि इसी के माध्यम से काव्य की विशेषताओं, उसके स्वरूप आदि की व्याख्या होती है। संस्कृत–साहित्य की टीका–परम्परा का अवलोकन करने से प्रतीत होता है कि समय–समय पर एक ही काव्य की अनेक टीकाएं लिखी जाती रही हैं। इससे जहाँ एक ओर टीकाकारों का सहृदय सामाजिक होना स्पष्ट होता है, वहीं दूसरी ओर काव्य का भावगत तथा शिल्पगत वैशिष्ट्य भी उद्‌घाटित होता है।

---

१. संस्कृत हिन्दी कोष (आप्टे) पृ. ४१३

२. अभिधान चिन्तामणि कोष २/१७०

३. काव्य मीमांसा २/पृ. २०२०

टीका–परम्परा अत्यन्त प्राचीन प्रतीत होती है। इसका प्रारम्भ वैदिक युग से माना जा सकता है। वेद के मन्त्रों की व्याख्या करने वाले ब्राह्मण ग्रन्थ टीका–परम्परा के आदि प्रवर्तक ग्रन्थ स्वीकार किये जा सकते हैं। इसी प्रकार निरुक्त नामक वेदाङ्ग भी निघण्टु का व्याख्यापरक ग्रन्थ ही माना गया है।[१]

मुद्राराक्षस नाटक पर रची गयी टीकाएं नाटक की लोकप्रियता की द्योतक हैं। ये एक ओर रचना के वैशिष्ट्य को सरल रूप में प्रस्तुत करती हैं, तो दूसरी ओर रचना की लोकप्रियता में भी प्रमाण हैं। एम्. कृष्णमाचार्य[२] ने मुद्राराक्षस के ग्यारह टीकाकारों का उल्लेख किया है, जिनके नाम इस प्रकार हैं– गौरीपति मिश्र के पुत्र बटेश्वर मिश्र, ढुण्ढिराज, स्वामीशास्त्री, तारानाथ तर्कवाचस्पति, महेश्वर, बटेश्वर प्राकृताचार्य केशव उपाध्याय, अभिराम, गृहेश्वर, जीवानन्द, विद्यासागर तथा शरभभूप। इस नाटक की तेरह टीकाएं तञ्जौर के सरस्वती महल पुस्तकालय के पाण्डुलिपि ग्रन्थागार में भी उपलब्ध हैं।[३] इन टीकाओं में शरभभूप की दो टीकाएँ हैं, जो देवनागरी लिपि तथा तेलगू लिपि में है। इसके अतिरिक्त इनमें दुण्ढिराज की जिन आठ टीकाओं का विवरण दिया गया है, उनमें से तीन हस्तलिखित प्रतियाँ पूर्ण हैं तथा पाँच अपूर्ण प्रतियाँ हैं। इस ग्रन्थागार में दो अपूर्ण हस्तलिखित प्रतियाँ भी सुरक्षित हैं, जिनके टीकाकार अज्ञात हैं।

इसके अतिरिक्त वहाँ इस नाटक की एक अन्य टीका सुरक्षित है, जो केवल उपोद्घात तक ही प्राप्त होती है, इसके टीकाकार घनश्याम हैं। वाराणसी के पाण्डुलिपि ग्रन्थागार में 'मुद्राराक्षस' नाटक की नौ हस्तलिखित प्रतियाँ उपलब्ध हैं।[४] जिनमें से छः हस्तलिखित टीकाएं दुण्ढिराज की हैं, दो रतिनाथ चक्रवर्ती तथा एक बटेश्वर की हस्तलिखित प्रति है। इन हस्तलिखित टीका–प्रतियों में ढुण्ढिराज की दो टीकाएं पूर्ण हैं तथा चार अपूर्ण हैं, जिनके लिपिकार भिन्न–भिन्न प्रतीत होते हैं, क्योंकि समस्त लिपिकारों की प्रतिलिपियों में हस्तलेख भिन्न हैं।

---

१. निघण्टु तथा निरुक्त, भूमिका, पृ. सं. ५

२. History of classical sanskrit literature, Pg. 608

३. Catalogues catalogoram sarasvati mahal library, Tanjore Vol. VIII, 1930

४. C.C. Sanskrit University (Sarasvati Bhavan Library) Vol. XI Sahitya, 1964.

इस प्रकार मुद्राराक्षस की बाइस टीकाएं प्राप्त होती हैं, जिनमें से तेरह की हस्तलिखित मातृकाएं हैं, तथा नव प्रकाशित हैं।

प्रस्तुत शोधपत्र में प्रधान रूप से प्रकाशित तथा अप्रकाशित मुख्य टीकाओं का ही सङ्क्षिप्त परिचय प्रस्तुत किया जा रहा है।

अप्रकाशित टीका ग्रन्थ

मुद्राराक्षस की अप्रकाशित टीकाओं का विवरण इस प्रकार है–

मुद्राप्रकाश

मुद्राराक्षस की 'मुद्राप्रकाश' नाम्नी अप्रकाशित टीका के टीकाकार बटेश्वर हैं। मिथिला के गौरीश्वर मिश्र के पुत्र के रूप में उल्लेख करते हुए कृष्णमाचार्य ने इनका पूरा नाम बटेश्वर मिश्र माना है।[1]

इनकी टीका की अपूर्ण हस्तलिखित प्रति सरस्वती भवन पुस्तकालय (वाराणसी) के पाण्डुलिपि ग्रन्थागार में सुरक्षित है।[2] जो देवनागरी लिपि में कागज पर उपलब्ध है, इस मातृका का आकार १०.६X४.५ से.मी. है।

मुद्रानिगर्वविस्तार

'मुद्राराक्षस' पर लिखी गयी रतिनाथ चक्रवर्ती-विरचित टीका 'मुद्रानिगर्वविस्तार' नाम से विख्यात है।[3] इस अप्रकाशित टीका की दो हस्तलिखित प्रतियाँ सरस्वती भवन वाराणसी के पाण्डुलिपि ग्रन्थागार में सुरक्षित हैं। देवनागरी लिपि में लिखी गयी रतिनाथ चक्रवर्ती की टीका का आधार कागज है, जिसका आकार ६.७X४.६ इंच है।

एक अन्य टीका

'मुद्राराक्षस' की एक अन्य टीका तथा टीकाकार का नाम ज्ञात नहीं है। यह टीका अपूर्ण है। हस्तमातृका में रूप उपलब्ध यह टीका अखिल भारतीय संस्कृत परिषद्, लखनऊ के पाण्डुलिपि ग्रन्थागार में सुरक्षित है।[4]

---

१. Vatesvara Mishra, son of Gauripati Mishra. H.C.S.L. K कृष्णमाचार्य, पृ. ६०८

२. सरस्वती भवन पुस्तकालय वाराणसी Vol XI, पृ. २१८

३. सरस्वती भवन पुस्तकालय वाराणसी Vol XI, क्रम सं. ४२७८३ पृ. २१८

४. Name of commentary and commentator inkurer. C.C. अखिल भारतीय संस्कृत परिषद् लखनऊ पृ. १५२

प्रकाशित टीका ग्रन्थ

'मुद्राराक्षस' की प्रकाशित टीकाओं को व्यवस्थित रूप में निम्नवत् देखा जा सकता है–

व्याख्यान

'मुद्राराक्षस' की 'व्याख्यान' नाम्नी टीका के टीकाकार हैं ढुण्ढिराज। इनका समय अठारहवीं शती का पूर्वार्द्ध है। इस टीका का प्रकाशन 'बाम्बे संस्कृत सिरीज' से सन् १६०० में डॉ. तैलङ्ग के द्वारा किया गया।[1]

ढुण्ढिराज की इस प्रति का सम्पादन डॉ. एम. आर. काले द्वारा किया गया है। इन्होंने ढुण्ढिराज की टीका को अङ्ग्रेजी अनुवाद तथा टिप्पणी सहित सम्पादित किया है।[2]

ढुण्ढिराज की हस्तमातृका का विवरण

ढुण्ढिराज की हस्त्लिखित मातृका की आठ प्रतियों का विवरण तञ्जौर के सरस्वती महल पुस्तकालय के हस्तलेखागार में उपलब्ध है तथा अन्य छः हस्तलिखित प्रतियों का विवरण वाराणसी के सरस्वती भवन पाण्डुलिपि ग्रन्थागार में उपलब्ध है।

मुद्राराक्षस विवृत्ति

मुद्राराक्षस विवृत्ति नामक टीका के टीकाकार पं. जीवानन्द विद्यासागर भट्टाचार्य हैं इनकी टीका का द्वितीय संस्करण सन् १८६२ ई. में कलकत्ता से प्रकाशित हुआ था।

मितभाषिणी

मुद्राराक्षस की 'मितभाषिणी' नाम्नी टीका के टीकाकार हैं– शारदा रञ्जन राय। इनकी टीका सन् १६१८ ई. में अंग्रेजी अनुवाद सहित कलकत्ता से प्रकाशित हुई थी।

मुद्रादीपिका

'मुद्रादीपिका' नाम्नी इस टीका के टीकाकार गृहेश्वर हैं। इनकी टीका का समय सत्रहवीं शताब्दी का उत्तरार्द्ध है।[3] (सं. १७५३) इसकी हस्तलिखित मातृका आर्यभाषा काशी नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा पुस्तकालय

---

१. डॉ. तैलङ्ग, मुद्राराक्षस, भूमिका, पृ. ८

२. डॉ. एम. आर. काले, द्वितीय संस्करण, बम्बई १६११

३. इति महामहोपाध्याय श्रीगृहेश्वर विरचितायां मुद्रादीपिकायां सप्तमोऽङ्कः समाप्तः।। संवत् १७५३, C. C. आर्यभाषा काशी नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा, चतुर्थ खण्ड

वाराणसी के हस्तलिखित ग्रन्थागार में सुरक्षित है।[1]

मुद्राराक्षस दीपिका

केशव उपाध्याय की टीका का नाम 'मुद्राराक्षस दीपिका' है। यह ताड़पत्र पर लिखी गयी है, तथा इसका रचनाकाल शक संवत् १६८३ है।[2]

इसके अतिरिक्त 'मुद्राराक्षस' नाटक की अन्य टीकाएं भी प्राप्त होती हैं, जिनमें से स्वामीशास्त्री की 'तात्पर्यबोधिनी'[3] टीका, डॉ. सत्यव्रत सिंह की 'शशिकला' टीका,[4] डॉ. रमाशङ्कर त्रिपाठी की 'रमा' टीका,[5] डॉ. जगदीश चन्द्र मिश्र की विमला टीका,[6] डॉ. निरूपणविद्यालङ्कार की 'मर्मप्रकाशिका'[7] तथा पं. परमेश्वरदीन पाण्डेय की 'सुधा'[8] नाम्नी टीकाएं प्रसिद्ध हैं।

इस प्रकार इन टीकाकारों ने विशाखदत्त के सहृदय पक्ष को अपनी विभिन्न प्रकार की व्याख्या से साकार किया है।

इन प्राप्त टीकाओं में कुछ टीकाएं अपूर्ण हैं, तो कुछ टीकाएं लिपिदोष तथा अक्षर दोष आदि से युक्त हैं। अतः प्रामाणिकता की दृष्टि से ढुण्ढिराज की टीका को श्रेष्ठ माना जा सकता है।

❑ ❑ ❑

---

१. केटेलॉगस केटेलॉगोरम आर्यभाषा पुस्तकालय काशी, नागरी प्रचारिणी सभा, चतुर्थ खण्ड, परिशिष्ट पृ. ४५२

२. डॉ. के. एच्. ध्रुव 'मुद्राराक्षस' भूमिका पृ. ५

३. तदेव, पृ. २७

४. मुद्राराक्षस, शशिकला टीका, सन् १६७३

५. मुद्राराक्षस, रमा टीका सन् १६६८ ई.

६. मुद्राराक्षस, विमला टीका सन् १६८१

७. मुद्राराक्षस, मर्मप्रकाशिका टीका – १६७६

८. मुद्राराक्षस, सुधा टीका – १६६१

संस्कृत एवं कम्प्यूटर की पारस्परिक उपकार्योपकारकता

पत्रिका जैन
शोधच्छात्रा

कम्प्यूटर एवं संस्कृत के आपसी सामञ्जस्य एवं सम्बन्ध पर जब भी चर्चा की जाती रही है, तब एक प्रश्न सबसे पहले उठता रहा है कि संस्कृत एवं कम्प्यूटर में क्या सम्बन्ध हो सकता है? संस्कृत अतिप्राचीन भाषा है तथा कम्प्यूटर अत्याधुनिक संयन्त्र है, उन दोनों के बीच में क्या सम्बन्ध हो सकता है? आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि संस्कृत, कम्प्यूटर तथा भाषाविज्ञान से सम्बन्धित क्षेत्रों के पारंगत लोग साथ बैठें और रेखाङ्किकत करें कि संस्कृत और कम्प्यूटर की महत्ता क्या है या क्या हो सकती है? हम इसी पर विचार करना चाहते हैं कि कम्प्यूटर विज्ञान के विकास में संस्कृत की क्या भूमिका हो सकती है और क्या है? कम्प्यूटर विज्ञान के ऐसे कौन–कौन से प्रसंग हैं, जो संस्कृत के अध्ययन, अध्यापन तथा अनुसंधान को नई दिशा दखा सकते हैं।

सङ्गणक का संक्षिप्त परिचय

संगणक आधुनिक तकनीकी युग की महत्त्वपूर्ण उपलब्धि है। कम्प्यूटर अत्याधिक श्रम व समय साध्य कार्य को मिनटों में कर सकता है। संगणक प्रक्रिया के दो प्रमुख लाभ हैं; पहला, यह कि बहुत छोटे से स्थान पर बहुत–सी और बहुत से क्षेत्रों की सामग्री और उससे सम्बन्धित जानकारी एकत्रित कर सुरक्षित की जा सकती; दूसरा– जो अल्प क्षेत्र में बहुत सारी सामग्री संग्रहीत की जाती है, उसे द्रुतगति से जब अपेक्षित हो, तब प्रत्याहूत (Recall) कर सकते हैं। साधारण कम्प्यूटर के माध्यम से संग्रहीत सामग्री का यह प्रत्याख्यान सैकेण्ड के २० लाख वें भाग में हो जाता है। अभीष्ट रचना का व्युत्पादन कम्प्यूटर मानव से अधिक वेग से

करता है। मनुष्य के द्वारा व्युत्पादित रचनाओं में यह व्युत्पादन प्रक्रिया दृष्टिगोचर नहीं हो सकती। व्युत्पादन का कार्य कम्प्यूटर में केन्द्रीय–संसाधन–इकाई (C.P.U.) के द्वारा होता है। कम्प्यूटर की इस इकाई में प्रमुख रूप से तीन भाग–(१) नियंत्रक इकाई (Control Unit), (२) मुख्य स्मृति पटल (Main Memory) तथा (३) गणितीय तार्किक इकाई (Arithmetical Logical Unit) होते हैं। मुख्य स्मृति पटल पर संग्रहण प्रक्रिया संख्यात्मक इकाइयों के द्वारा होती है तथा सम्पूर्ण सामग्री (Data) संग्रहण इकाई (Storage Unit) में संगृहीत हो जाती है। जिस समय कम्प्यूटर कार्य करता है, उस समय सामग्री 'रैम' (Random Access Memory) में तात्कालिक रूप से संगृहीत हो जाती है। गणितीय इकाई का प्रयोग उन संख्याओं पर विभिन्न गणितीय प्रक्रियाओं के संचालनार्थ होता है, जो संख्याएँ मुख्य स्मृतिपटल पर संगृहीत हैं। इस पटल में संगृहीत संख्याओं से विभिन्न गणितीय संचालनों के माध्यम से भाँति–भाँति के गणनात्मक परिणाम प्राप्त किये जाते हैं। कम्प्यूटर को दिये जाने वाले प्रत्येक निर्देश को एक शब्द (Word) माना जाता है और यह १२ बिटों का होता है। १२ बिटों में प्रथम चार के द्वारा क्या आपरेशन किया जाना है ? बतलाया जाता है तथा अन्तिम चार के द्वारा उस स्मृति (Memory) का नम्बर बताया जाता है, जहाँ सम्बन्धित संख्या संचित होती है। कुल मिलाकर अंकों के रूप में संगणक के रूप में विकसित किया गया निर्देशों का निकाय ही मशीन कूट है।

कम्प्यूटर हर प्रकार के ज्ञान (Data) को द्वि-आधारी अंकों (Binary) अर्थात् 'O' और '१' में परिवर्तित कर देता है। जब की-बोर्ड की सहायता से कम्प्यूटर में जानकारी (Data) प्रविष्ट की जाती हैं, तो कम्प्यूटर हर वर्ण, अंक या प्रतीक (Symbol) को एस्काई कोड (American Standard Code for Information Interchange) के अनुरूप द्वि-आधारी कोड में बदल देता है। अतएव कम्प्यूटर में जो भी सामग्री प्रविष्ट होती है, वह सभी द्वि-आधारी रूप में परिवर्तित होकर ही कम्प्यूटर में संगृहीत होती है। प्रश्न उठता है कि कम्प्यूटर बाइनरी कोड पर ही कार्य क्यों करता है ? कम्प्यूटर के बाइनरी कोड के अनुरूप कार्य करने का कारण यह है कि इलेक्ट्रानिक सर्किट स्विचों के आधार पर काम करती है, जिसके बन्द या खुले होने की स्थिति में (इलेक्ट्रानिक पल्स) विद्युत तरंगें उत्पन्न होती हैं या नहीं होती हैं। 'O' का अर्थ है सर्किट का खुला होना तथा '१' का

अर्थ है सर्किट का बन्द होना। सर्किट बन्द होने का तात्पर्य विद्युतीय तरंगों के जारी होने से है। द्वि-आधारी कोड को ८ अंकों के समूह में लिखा जाता है और इस पूरे समूह को 'बाइट' कहा जाता है। १ बाइट से एक प्रतीक (Character) या एक ऑपरेशन को प्रदर्शित कर सकते हैं। इस रूप में जो कार्य कम्प्यूटर से करते हैं, या करवाना चाहते हैं, तो कार्य करवाना अति जटिल हो जाएगा, इसलिए प्राकलन (प्रोग्राम) लिखने के लिए असेम्बली कोड का उपयोग किया जाता है। यह कोडिंग ही कम्प्यूटर की उच्चस्तरीय भाषा मानी जाती है।

क्रिस्टोफर स्टैची ने कम्प्यूटर को एक ऐसे संयंत्र के रूप में माना है, जो प्रतीकों को संसाधित करता है और विकसित रूप में यह स्वीकार करते हैं कि कम्प्यूटर प्रतीकों की शृङ्खला के रूप में निवेशित सामग्री (Input Material) को सुनिश्चित नियमों के आधार पर जो नियम पूर्व में ही कम्प्यूटर को प्राकलन (प्रोग्राम) के रूप में दिए गये हैं, प्रतीकों की द्वितीय शृङ्खला, जो कि अभीष्ट मानी जाती है, के रूप में निर्गमित (output) करता है अर्थात् जिन बिन्दुओं के आधार पर प्रतीकों की एक शृङ्खला को संसाधित करना होता है, वे नियम भी एक योजनाबद्ध तरीके से प्रतीकों की शृङ्खला के रूप में ही कम्प्यूटर को दिये जाते हैं। विचार यह है कि कम्प्यूटर का प्राकलन (Program) भी प्रतीकों की शृङ्खला के रूप में ही होता है। वर्तमान में ऐसे बहुत से साफ्टवेयर बेसिक, फोट्रोन, प्रोलॉग, सी, सी++, विजुअल बेसिक, फॉक्सप्रो आदि हैं, जिनकी सहायता से अपने उद्देश्य प्राकलन को बना कम्प्यूटर से संस्कृत आदि भाषाओं के विकास व विश्लेषण में सहयोग लिया जा सकता है।

सङ्गणक के लिए उपकारक का प्रश्न पाश्चात्य मत में

कई कम्प्यूटर विशेषज्ञों की राय में संस्कृत भाषा सङ्गणक के लिए सर्वश्रेष्ठ भाषा सिद्ध होगी। इसके दो कारण हैं– पहला : इसके शब्दों में उर्वरता अधिक है; और द्वितीय : इसकी विभक्तियाँ या रूप सङ्गणक के लिए बहुत सुविधाजनक हैं, क्योंकि इनके अनुरूप किसी शब्द के अन्त में केवल एक मात्रा बदल देने या एक अक्षर जोड़ देने से उसका भाव बदल जाता है। कहने का अभिप्राय यह है कि संस्कृत भाषा की उपयोगिता को विदेशी विद्वान् भी स्वीकार करते रहे हैं, जबकि भारतीय विद्वान् स्वयं इस ओर से उदासीन हैं और जानने, समझने तथा खोजने का कोई प्रयास

करते भी दृष्टिगत नहीं होते। १६८६ में सर विलियम जोन्स ने बंगाल रॉयल एशियाटिक सोसाइटी में अपने भाषण में कहा था– "चाहे संस्कृत भाषा कितनी ही पुरानी हो, उसका गठन अद्भुत है। वह ग्रीक से भी अधि ाक पूर्ण है, उसका शब्द भण्डार लेटिन से भी अधिक व्यापक है। वह इन दोनों से अधिक परिमार्जित एवं उत्कृष्ट है......" १६८४–८५ में यू.एस.ए. के मि. रिक ब्रिंग्स नामक नासा वैज्ञानिकों ने 'एल' नामक पत्रिका में व्याकरण शब्दबोध एवं विज्ञान के प्रतीक नेटवर्क स्कीम पर और मशीन अनुवाद के लिए संस्कृत की वास्तविक प्रकृति पर दो आलेख प्रस्तुत किये, जिसमें उन्होंने सुझाव देते हुए यह निष्कर्ष दिया कि विभिन्न प्राकृतिक भाषाओं (नेचुरल लैंग्वेज) को लेकर यूनीवर्सल मशीन अनुवाद तथा मशीनी भाषा के रूप में संस्कृत को लिया जा सकता है। यह उल्लेख डॉ. पी. रामानुजन के एक आलेख 'इसूज इन कम्प्यूटर–बेस्ड संस्कृत स्टडीज' में मिलता है। वे लिखते हैं कि–

"Mr. Rick Brings, a scientist of NASA, USA, in Al Magazine, in 1984 & 85. The tone and tenor of these papers suggested that the conclusion has been drawn after trying quite a good number of other 'natural' languages a candidates for the purpose of a universal machine translation Interlingua. This triggered a series of efforts both at home and abroad, in the field of Sanskrit and Computers, almost making the subject of topical interest in the Computer circles, then."

संस्कृत भाषा का कम्प्यूटर के विकास में योगदान–

प्रत्येक भाषा की दो प्रकार की संरचनाएँ होती हैं; (१) भौतिक संरचना, जिसे शुद्ध संरचना भी कहा जा सकता है; और (२) आर्थी संरचना, जो कि शुद्ध संरचना की सहायता से ही अभिव्यक्त होती है। इन्हीं दोनों प्रकार की संरचनाओं के आपसी सम्बन्ध को कालिदास ने 'वागर्थाविव' संपृक्तौ' के रूप में लिखा है। भाषा संरचना के क्षेत्र में कम्प्यूटर का आज जो कुछ भी योग गिनाया जाता है, वह उसका स्वयं का नहीं, अपितु संस्कृत की परम्परा से लिया हुआ रूप है, जिसका परिमार्जन करके, जिसको परिष्कृत करके कम्प्यूटर की भाषा के रूप में प्रयोग किया जा रहा है।

एक ही भाषा का प्रतिमान चाहें हिन्दी को ही मान सकते हैं एक प्रतिमान में अर्थात् चाम्स्की के रूपांतरणपरक प्रतिमान में तैयार किया गया विश्लेषक हिन्दी के ही संरचनात्मक प्रतिमान के विश्लेषक से पृथक् होगा

तथा उसके विश्लेषण की पद्धति भी भिन्न ही होगी। इसीलिए भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान कानपुर ने कारक की अपरिहार्यता को मानते हुए पाणिनीय विश्लेषक तैयार किया। यह कम्प्यूटर की संस्कृत के क्षेत्र को अभूतपूर्व देन है या यूँ कहें कम्प्यूटर की संस्कृत के प्रति सहयोग का प्रारम्भ है। इनके द्वारा तैयार किया गया पाणिनीय विश्लेषक पाणिनि के नाम से अवश्य है, परन्तु पूर्णतः पाणिनीय नहीं है, क्योंकि पाणिनि का व्याकरण केवल कारकीय सम्बन्ध मात्र नहीं है, यह अक्षरप्रतीकों से प्रारम्भ होकर क्रमशः उत्तरोत्तर संरचनाओं को गढ़ते हुए महावाक्य–पर्यन्त विश्लेषण की तकनीक और नियम बताता है। एक ओर वह धातुओं आदि की सूची के द्वारा (गणपाठ) संरचनात्मक इकाइयों को बताता है, वहीं दूसरी ओर कृदन्त और तद्धित प्रक्रिया के विभिन्न सञ्ज्ञा रूपों को गढ़ता है, इसी तरह नामधातु, प्रत्ययों आदि का प्रयोग करते हुए विभिन्न क्रिया रूपों की सर्जन–प्रक्रिया सिखाता है। इन सबकी महत्ता समान है क्योंकि इनका प्रयोग भाषायी विश्लेषक और सृजन के लिए अपरिहार्य है। संस्कृत की क्रिया, सञ्ज्ञा, अव्यय, कारक आदि की फार्म पर सी.डेक, पुणे तथा देश भर के प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान आदि कार्य कर रहे हैं, वहाँ इस प्रकार का कार्य हुआ भी होगा, जिससे संस्कृत को एक नयी दिशा मिलेगी और मिलनी चाहिए भी तथा कम्प्यूटर का संस्कृत को सहयोग और अधिक बढ़ना चाहिए। यदि कम्प्यूटर संस्कृत को समृद्ध, परिष्कृत कर रहा है, तो संस्कृत का योगदान भी कम्प्यूटर के क्षेत्र में किसी से कम नहीं है। कम्प्यूटर में जो प्राकलन (Pragram) बनाया जाता है, वह सूत्र रूप होता है अर्थात् नपी–तुली भाषा में कम्प्यूटर को कार्य करने का निर्देश दिया जाता है। कम्प्यूटर के प्राकलन में इस सूत्ररूप शैली का प्रयोग संस्कृत के व्याकरण की सूत्रात्मक पद्धति पर ही आधृत है। वैसे भी यदि प्राकलन को सूत्ररूप में नहीं लिखेंगे तब विस्तार में आई त्रुटियों को खोज कर दूर कर पाना अत्यन्त जटिल हो जाएगा।

अनन्त ज्ञानराशि के प्रस्तुतीकरण की समस्या का समाधान संस्कृत शास्त्रों के सहयोग से ही संभव है। अन्य पश्चिमी प्रविधियाँ इस दिशा में अपूर्ण–सी दिखती हैं, अतः इस दिशा में खोज की आवश्यकता है। भारतीय शास्त्रीय चिन्तन और उसकी परम्परा अन्य (पश्चिमी इत्यादि) प्रविधियों से पृथक् है, क्योंकि यहाँ विभिन्न ज्ञानशास्त्रों के मध्य परस्पर पूरकता का, सम्बद्धता का भाव है। हमारे यहाँ संस्कृत में तो षड्दर्शन

मीमांसा, न्याय, तर्क, सांख्य, योग, जैन, बौद्ध दर्शनों से सम्बन्धित अनन्त ज्ञानराशि समाहित है। वैज्ञानिकों का ध्यान इस ओर आकृष्ट होना चाहिए और कम्प्यूटर पर इसको समायोजित करने का भाव भी उनके हृदय में जागृत होना चाहिए। पूर्व राष्ट्रपति स्व. डॉ. शङ्कर दयाल शर्मा जी के ग्रन्थ "हिन्दी भाषा और भारतीय संस्कृति" में संस्कृत को कम्प्यूटर सञ्चालन में श्रेष्ठ माध्यम बताते हुए उल्लिखित है– "कम्प्यूटर कार्यक्रम तथा सञ्चालन में प्रयोग के लिए विभिन्न भाषाओं तथा लिपियों के सापेक्ष उपयुक्तता सम्बन्धी प्रयोगसिद्ध अध्ययनों से पता चलता है कि ब्राह्मी से निकली विभिन्न लिपियों वाली संस्कृत न केवल सर्वाधिक उपयुक्त है अपितु वह तो कम्प्यूटर सञ्चालन में उपयोग के लिए श्रेष्ठ माध्यम की प्रत्येक अपेक्षा को पूरा करती है।"

संस्कृत-भाषा के विकास में कम्प्यूटर की उपयोगिता

सामान्यतः सङ्गणकीय क्षेत्रों का प्रयोग अनेक उद्देश्यों के लिए किया जाता है। जैसे– विभक्तिजनित रूपों को पहचानना, वर्तनी की अशुद्धियों को सुधारना, किसी शब्द की कोशीय परिभाषा जानना, शब्द विशेष की व्युत्पत्तियाँ व पर्यायवाची जानना इत्यादि। कम्प्यूटर की सहायता से संस्कृत का शब्दकोश तैयार किया जाना चाहिए, जिससे सबसे बड़ा लाभ यह होगा कि यदि किसी कारणवश प्रविष्टि पूर्ण रूप से नहीं की जा सकी या किसी विद्वान् ने कुछ परिवर्तन करने का सुझाव दिया है, तो उस प्रविष्टि या सुझाव को तुरन्त इस कोश में कम्प्यूटर की सहायता से समाहित कर सकते हैं, जिससे संस्कृत का शब्दकोश और अधिक सुसमृद्ध होगा। इससे न केवल संस्कृत को ही, वरन् कम्प्यूटर को भी लाभ मिलेगा। विद्वद्गण ऐसी मान्यता रखते हैं कि कम्प्यूटर की प्रोग्रामिंग यदि संस्कृत भाषा में हो, तो वह और सरल हो जाएगी। यदि संस्कृत का कोश उपलब्ध रहेगा, तो इस क्षेत्र में गहन रूप से अध्ययन किया जा सकेगा। वैसे शब्दकोश के निर्माण का कार्य बड़ा ही जटिल होता है, क्योंकि इसमें वर्षों लगते हैं फिर भी कुछ न कुछ तो रह ही जाता है और कितना भी प्रयास करने के बाद पूर्णता का रूप नहीं दे पाते। कम्प्यूटर के माध्यम से उसमें निरन्तर सुधार करते रह सकते हैं, इसके साथ ही जिस शब्द की आवश्यकता होगी, वह शब्द कम्प्यूटर की एक कमांड से सहज बोधगम्य हो जाएगा। मनुष्य की सहायता हेतु

यांत्रिक कोश तैयार करना मशीन के अनुप्रयोग का सबसे छोटा स्तर है, जिसके माध्यम से कम्प्यूटर स्वयं भी लाभान्वित हो सकता है, इस प्रकार सङ्गणक संस्कृत भाषा के अनन्त ज्ञान–राशि की धारा को आधुनिक तरीके से आगे बढ़ाने में अत्यधिक सहयोग कर सकता है।

भारतीय भाषाओं के अध्ययन में कम्प्यूटर के सहयोग की पृष्ठभूमि पर विचार करते समय संस्कृत के सहयोग की आवश्यकता होती है, क्योंकि समस्त भारतीय भाषाएँ किसी न किसी रूप में संस्कृत से जुड़ी हैं। लगभग सभी भारतीय भाषाओं की व्याकरणीय संरचना तथा वाक्य–संरचना इत्यादि भी ऐसी है जिनका अध्ययन संस्कृत के व्याकरण मॉडल के आधार पर कर सकते हैं, साथ ही लगभग समस्त भारतीय भाषाएँ संस्कृत से सम्पृक्त हैं, उनके अधिकांश शब्दरूप संस्कृत की परम्परा से ही आगे बढ़कर वहाँ तक पहुँचे हैं, अतएव इन विभिन्न भारतीय भाषाओं के अध्ययन में कम्प्यूटर का सहयोग लेने के लिए संस्कृत की सहायता लेना आवश्यक होना चाहिए। इस प्रकार जब भी इन भारतीय भाषाओं का अध्ययन कम्प्यूटर के माध्यम से किया जायगा, तब कम्प्यूटर पर संस्कृत मॉडल की आवश्यकता होगी। केवल भारतीय भाषाओं के सन्दर्भ में यह बात नहीं है, अपितु विश्व की बहुत सी भाषाओं के सन्दर्भ में यह बात कही जा सकती है।

भारतीय भाषाओं में काम करने के लिए सङ्गणक के क्षेत्र में सुलिपि एवं श्रीलिपि नामक सोफ्टवेयर का निर्माण हुआ है। सुलिपि में ध्वनिविज्ञान की सहायता से हिन्दी उच्चारण को अंग्रेजी में टाइप करके सरलतापूर्वक हिन्दी में लिख सकते हैं और इसके लिए लिपि या हिन्दी के की-बोर्ड की जानकारी होना आवश्यक नहीं है। इस सुलिपि सोफ्टवेयर की सहायता से संस्कृत आदि नव लिपियों में कार्य कर सकते हैं। कम्प्यूटर का हिन्दी, संस्कृत आदि भाषाओं के क्षेत्र में यह योगदान लाभप्रद है। सी. डेक, पुणे ने भारतीय भाषाओं में सहयोग करने वाले इसी प्रकार के अनेक सक्षम साफ्टवेयर बनाये हैं, जिनसे विभिन्न भारतीय भाषाओं के अध्ययन सम्बन्धी आवश्यकताएँ पूरी होती रही हैं। यद्यपि इस क्षेत्र में अभी और कार्य होना शेष है, जिस पर ध्यान देना आवश्यक है। वर्तमान में इंटरनेट पर ऐसी साइटें उपलब्ध हैं जो संस्कृत के ज्ञानभण्डार से सम्बन्धित हैं; परन्तु इनमें त्रुटियों की अधिकता है, इनको और अधिक परिमार्जित करने

की आवश्यकता है।

भावी सम्भावनाएँ

शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में यद्यपि कम्प्यूटर अध्यापक का विकल्प तो नहीं हो सकता, पर हाँ, वह अध्यापक के कार्य में सहयोगी अवश्य बन सकता है और संस्कृत भाषा के शिक्षण में सहायक हो सकता है। कम्प्यूटर सदैव ही सम्भावित प्रश्नों के आधार पर सम्भावित समाधानों को लेकर ही कार्यरत होता है। अनेक बार यह परिलक्षित होता है कि अध्ययन–अध्यापन के समय ऐसे कई प्रश्न सामने आते हैं, जो कि पूर्व में कभी चर्चित नहीं हुए हैं, अतएव ऐसे स्थलों पर निर्णय अध्यापक को ही करना पड़ता है, यह कार्य कम्प्यूटर नहीं कर सकता है, क्योंकि कम्प्यूटर के पास अपना तो कुछ होता नहीं, उसे जो निर्देश दिया जाता है, वह वही कार्य करता है और समस्या आने पर समस्या का निराकरण नहीं कर पाता। संस्कृत भाषा के शिक्षण में कम्प्यूटर की महत्त्वपूर्ण भूमिका यह हो सकती है कि प्रारम्भिक स्तर पर छोटे-छोटे पाठ-शक्षक सॉफ्टवेयर तैयार करें, जो प्रारम्भिक स्तर की संस्कृत सिखाएँ। प्रारम्भिक शिक्षण के लिए विकासकर्ता को संस्कृत की आधारभूत बनावट के लिए सभी नियम भी देने पड़ेंगे और यही बात उच्च स्तर पर भी लागू होगी। इस तरह क्षीण हो रहा संस्कृत का अस्तित्व और भी स्थापित होगा, अतः विशेषज्ञ बैठकर प्राकलनकर्ता (Programmer) की सहायता से ऐसे पाठ–शिक्षक सॉफ्टवेयर बनाएँ, जिससे संस्कृत के विकास को एक नयी दिशा मिल सके तथा जो सभी को सरलता से प्राप्त हो सकें।

यदि भारतीय भाषाओं के लिए सङ्गणकाधृत वर्तनीशोधक विकसित करना है, तब यह आवश्यक होगा कि वर्तनीशोधक (spell-checker) के विकास में संस्कृत को आधारत्वेन स्वीकार करें, क्योंकि समस्त भारतीय भाषाओं की लगभग ६० प्रतिशत शब्दावली संस्कृत के मूल से आई हुई मानी जाती है, साथ ही संस्कृत व्याकरण में शब्दों के मूलाधार को लेकर उनके शब्दों को व्युत्पादित करने की सुव्यवस्थित, सुविचारित प्रक्रिया पहले से ही प्राप्त है, जिसे 'प्रक्रिया' के नाम से माना जाता है। इस प्रक्रिया के नियमों को आधार बनाकर बड़ी सरलता से संस्कृत शब्द– रचना के लिए वर्तनीशोधक विकसित किया जा सकता है, क्योंकि इसके लिए नियमों को बनाना नहीं है, नियम तो परम्परा से प्राप्त हैं ही केवल उनको कम्प्यूटर

पर प्रस्तुत करने की कला मात्र से ही यह कार्य सम्भव है। लगभग समस्त भारतीय भाषाओं की शब्दव्युत्पादक व्यवस्था समान ही है, अतएव संस्कृत के हितार्थ विकसित सङ्गणकीय वर्तनीशोधक को आधार स्वीकार करके अन्य भारतीय भाषाओं के लिए भी संगणकीय वर्तनीशोधक विकसित किए जा सकते हैं। यह संस्कृताधृत वर्तनीशोधक कम्प्यूटर के क्षेत्र में बहुत महत्त्वपूर्ण होगा क्योंकि अंग्रेजी का वर्तनीशोधक तो पहले से उपलब्ध है। हिन्दी के लिए अभी कोई मानक वर्तनीशोधक नहीं बना है। विदेशी विद्वानों की भी ऐसी मान्यता है कि संस्कृत के आधार पर बनाई गई 'लैंग्वेज' कम्प्यूटर को सरल बना देगी, अतः वर्तनीशोधक न केवल संस्कृत को आधार देगा, बल्कि हिन्दी अन्य भारतीय भाषाओं के अध्ययन में भी सहयोगी बनेगा; साथ ही कम्प्यूटर के लिए मशीन लैंग्वेज के रूप में एक आधार देने का कार्य भी कर सकेगा, अतः इस ओर ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए।

वर्तमान समय में आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जिस प्रकार पाणिनि ने ध्वनि से लेकर महावाक्य-पर्यन्त विश्लेषण के लिए अपने व्याकरण में नियम दिये उसी प्रकार आज भी कम्प्यूटर की सीमाओं के साथ व्याकरण में एक समाकलित प्रतिमान को विकसित किया जाए, जो भाषा की पूर्णता को और उस पूर्णता के विभिन्न पक्षों को एक साथ समझे। इस तरह का समाकलित प्रतिमान स्थापित कर लेने पर ही सङ्गणकीय प्राकृतिक संसाधन में पूर्णरूप सफल हुआ जा सकता है। पाणिनीय परम्परा में संस्कृत के पास इस प्रकार के प्रतिमान हैं, जिनका प्रयोग कम्प्यूटर के क्षेत्र में किया जा सकता है। इसी प्रकार कम्प्यूटर में समस्या निराकरण की विधि भी एकपक्षीय न होकर बहुपक्षीय होती है, अतः कम्प्यूटर की समस्या को सुलझाने के लिए उसके कई स्तरों तक जाना होता है, तब कहीं समस्या का समाधान मिल पाता है, किन्तु कम्प्यूटर उसको कुछ सेकेण्ड में ही पूर्ण कर देता है। यतो हि सम्पूर्ण भारतीय तन्त्र आपस में एक–दूसरे से सम्पृक्त है। जैसे यदि चिकित्साविज्ञान का अध्ययन करना है, तब चिकित्साविज्ञान में भी संस्कृत के किसी न किसी पहलू से जुड़ना होगा, क्योंकि आधारभूत चिकित्सा–विज्ञान संस्कृत के चरक–संहिता आदि ग्रन्थों में समाहित है। इस प्रकार कम्प्यूटर के माध्यम से इसका अध्ययन एक स्थान पर सम्भव होगा।

इस प्रकार उपर्युक्त विवेचन से संस्कृत एवं कम्प्यूटर के मध्य जो

सम्बन्ध है– वह स्पष्ट हो जाता है। कम्प्यूटर के मशीनी अनुवाद के लिए समतुल्यों के कोश, स्रोतपाठ के विश्लेषण एवं लक्ष्यपाठ के सर्जन में संस्कृत ज्ञानराशि की महत्त्वपूर्ण भूमिका है। कम्प्यूटर की जो कृत्रिम मेधा है, वह संस्कृत को पूर्ण विकसित करने में सहयोगी सिद्ध हो सकती है, और है भी। संस्कृत के क्षेत्र में कम्प्यूटर का अधिक से अधिक प्रयोग एक क्रान्ति ला सकता है। संस्कृत भाषा के शिक्षण में, शोध में तथा विश्लेषण इत्यादि में कम्प्यूटर का अभूतपूर्व योग हो सकता है। इसी प्रकार कम्प्यूटर के क्षेत्र में संस्कृत के प्रतिमानों का यदि प्रयोग किया जाये, तो कम्प्यूटर की कार्यशैली को और अधिक परिष्कृत रूप दिया जा सकता है, जिससे कम्प्यूटर की भाषा अधिक सरल होगी, जो उसके विस्तार में और अधिक सहायक सिद्ध होगी।

❑ ❑ ❑